

A N
ACCOUNT
OF THE
GOVERNMENT
OF THE
Christian Church,
FOR
The first Six Hundred YEARS.

Particularly Shewing,

- I. The Apostolical Practice of Diocesan and Metropolitan Episcopacy.
- II. The Usurpation of Patriarchal and Papal Authority.
- III. The War of Two Hundred Years between the Bishops of *Rome* and *Constantinople* for Universal Supremacy.

By *Samuel Parker* D. D. Arch-Deacon
of C A N T E R B U R Y.

L O N D O N:

Printed for *John Baker* at the three Pigeons in
St. Paul's Church Yard, MDCLXXXIII.

ACCOUNT

GOVERNMENT

OF THE

NAVY

1861

THE CONTENTS.

Sect. I. **T**He Apostles Bishops over the Churches of their own Planting. St. James proper Bishop of Jerusalem. The Episcopal and Apostolical Office the same, Page 1.

§. II. The Vanity of the Argument for Parity from the Promiscuous use of the Words Bishop and Presbyter in the Apostolical Age; The Texts of Scripture Alledged by the Presbyterians turn'd upon themselves, p. 11.

§. III. The Contests between the Presbyters and Deacons at Rome in St. Jerom's time; occasion'd both his and the Counterfeit Ambrose; and the Author of the Questions upon the Old and New Testament, high Expressions about the Presbyters Office; the Antients that divide the Clergy into two Orders of Priest and Deacon, Subdivide the Priesthood into Bishop and Presbyter, p. 28.

§. IV. No unknown Interval of time after the Apostles, the known Succession to them in the greatest Churches by single Persons, p. 46.

§. V. The Community of the names Bishop and Presbyter proper to the Apostolical times, the destruction of the Names observed by all the Fathers, p. 54.

§. VI.

A 2

The Contents.

§. VI. *St. Clement Bishop of Rome an undoubted Witness of Episcopal Superiority, and vindicated from the Cavils of the Adversaries, especially Blondel. And his dream of succeeding in the Presidency by meer Seniority largely confuted,* p. 61.

§. VII. *The Testimonies of Ignatius and Policarp clear'd,* p. 85.

§. VIII. *The Testimonies of Hermas, Pope Pius, the Church of Rome at the time of Marcion's coming thither, Justin Martyr, Papias, the Gallican Church, Ireneus, Victor Bishop of Rome, and Clemens Alexandrinus vindicated,* p. 93.

§. IX. *The woful Disingenuity of Blondel in his Allegations from Tertullian, Origen, St. Cyprian, Eusebius, St. Hillary, &c. Sufficiently displayed and exposed,* p. 106.

§. X. *The Practice of the Apostolical Church the best Evidence of our Saviours Institution. The bounds of Churches Accommodated to the Civil Government,* p. 123.

§. XI. *The first Church Society a Bishop with his Presbyters Presiding over a City and its Territories. And the first Rule of their Government that nothing be done without the Bishop,* p. 128.

§. XII. *The Practice and Canons of the Ancient Church for one Bishop over a City and its Territories,* p. 137.

§. XIII.

The Contents.

§. XIII. *Of the Rise, Nature and Office of the Chorepiscopi in the Ancient Church: That they were true and Proper Bishops,*

p. 145.

§. XIV. *The Apostolical Institution of Metropolitans,*

p. 161.

§. XV. *Various Instances of the Practice of Metropolitcal Government in the Primitive Church. Salmasius his Vanity, in Endeavouring to oppose it, largely prov'd,*

p. 171.

§. XVI. *The rise of Patriarchates was by meer Usurpation, and all along opposed by the Laws and Canons of the Church,*

p. 188.

§. XVII. *The sixth Canon of Nice to be understood of Metropolitcal not Patriarchal Preheminenes, this proved at large against Petrus de Marca and Valesius,*

p. 197.

§. XVIII. *Patriarchates not erected by the second General Council at Constantinople. Socrates his mistake that they were. The Testimonies of St. Jerom, Innocent the first, and Johannes Scholasticus confuted and overthrown. Pope Innocent the first noted to have been the first Author of Usurpation,*

p. 213.

§. XIX. *The Constantinopolitan Canon farther explained against Patriarchal Power, and the third General Council at Ephesus shewn expressly and industriously to oppose the same Usurpation,*

p. 225.

§. XX.

The Contents.

§. XX. *No Patriarchal Power known to the more ancient Provincial Synods, particularly those of Antioch and Sardica,* p. 235.

§. XXI. *The Patriarchal Usurpation first begun at Constantinople, the occasion of it the Grandeur of the City, and Theodosius his favour to it, but was first own'd and ratified by the Council of Calcedon,* p. 243.

§. XXII. *The Story of this Usurpation by the Communicatory Bishops set up by Theodosius, by Nectarius of Constantinople; and the συνέδος ἐκδημοῦσα or Synod casually, and yet perpetually there residing,* p. 255.

§. XXIII. *This Usurpation farther improved by the uncanonical Proceedings of St. Chrysostom, whilst Arch-Bishop of Constantinople.* p. 263.

§. XXIV. *The farther Advancement of this Usurpation to the time of the Calcedon Council. Of the Exarchs of Diocesses,* p. 276.

§. XXV. *The compleat settlement of this Usurpation by the Council of Calcedon,* p. 285.

§. XXVI. *The stout Opposition of Pope Leo the first in defence of the Nicene Canons and the rights of Metropolitans. The Constantinopolitan Usurpation, Recovered to its full height by Acacius in spite of all the Power of Rome,* p. 296.

§. XXVII. *The Earnest but vain Endeavours of the Popes, Felix, Gelasius, and*

The Contents.

and Symmachus to have the name of Acacius expunged out of the Dypticks, p. 305.

§. XXVIII. Pope Hormisdas his absolute Conquest over the Constantinopolitans, p. 312.

§. XXIX. How and when the Title of Patriarchs came into the Church. By what means the See of Jerusalem became Patriarchal, p. 317.

§. XXX. The Transactions in the Controversie between Rome and Constantinople, in the time of Boniface the second, as far as the contest concern'd Illyricum, p. 324.

§. XXXI. The Deposition of Anthimus of Constantinople by Pope Agapetus. A large account of Pope Vigilius his wild and extravagant Actings, and P. de Marca's Apology in his behalf answer'd and confuted, p. 332.

§. XXXII. The contest about the Title of Universal Bishop between John of Constantinople and Gregory of Rome in the Reign of Mauritius. Gregory's Sordid Flattery of the Tyrant Phocas, Boniface the third first declared by Phocas head of the Universal Church. A bold challenge of Baronius accepted, against all the Champions of the Roman Usurpation. p. 344.

The most material E R R A T A that
disturbe the Sense, are these.

PAge 49. Line 10. Where after *Antichristian* should be
put this point? and l. 11. after *principles* this, p. 82.
l. 11. after *succeeded* is left out, without any further Consec-
ration, and that. p. 83. l. 14. for *tell* read *tells*. p. 100. l.
10. for *that reason* r. *what reason*. p. 109. last line but one,
for *Diaconum* r. *Diaconorum*. p. 114. l. 25. for *I if* r. *if I*.
p. 178. l. 19. for *two* r. *too*. p. 179. l. 12. for *possibly* r.
positively. ib. l. 18. for *Conons* r. *Canons*. p. 183. l. 7.
for *leepfi* r. *lapfi*. p. 187. l. 1. for *case* r. *cast*. p. 211. l. 4.
for *he* r. *We*. p. 225. l. 17. for *gives* r. *give*. p. 252. l. 4.
for *Gregoris* r. *Gregorius*. p. 273. l. 12. after *usurp'd* it,
there wants *what*. p. 277. l. 10. for *his* r. *their*. p. 297. l.
27. for *about* r. *above*. p. 311. l. penult. after *some* there
wants *of*. p. 331. l. 25. for *inscrip.* r. *manuscript*. p. 334. l.
17. for *third* r. *tria*. p. 335. l. 14. for *design* r. *deign*. p.
338. l. 2. for *their inconstancy* r. *his inconstancy*. p. 356. l.
30. for *Challengers* r. *Challenges*.

SECTION I.

OU R Blessed Savior, having Establish'd the Society of his Church in the World, and vested it with a Power of Jurisdiction within it Self, and settled the Supream Authority over it, in the Order of Apostles, and their Successors for ever; the next thing to be considered for the true stating of the Primitive and Apostolical Form, is to find out how they reduc'd their Master's Institution to Practice, in what manner, and upon what grounds they proceeded in their founding and erecting of Churches. For when our Savior had prescrib'd the original Platform, they were left (as the nature of the thing requir'd) to their own Prudence, Judgment and Discretion for the manner of framing the Work, and raising the Building. Thus for Example, tho He had vested the Apostolical Order and Succession with Supremacy of Jurisdiction in the Church, Yet He hath no where prescrib'd

B

the

the Bounds of every mans Jurisdiction, but hath left that to be determin'd by Themself's, when they came to reduce his Institution to Practice, as They should judge most serviceable to the true Interest and Advantage of Christianity. But beside the Edification of the Church, they were to have a special Regard to the Peace and Quiet of Civil Government, so as not to interfere with, or any way disturb it, by the Exercise of their Jurisdiction. For as our Savior in Erecting of his Kingdom, was above all things tender of the Right of Sovereign Powers, So are all his truly Loyal Subjects strictly oblig'd above all things to be most punctual and conscientious in the great Duty of Allegiance and Subjection to their Lawful Prince. And therefore to discover the true Settlement of Christian Churches in the World, most for the Interest both of Government and Religion, We must compare the Apostles Practice with our Savior's Institution. And by that means we shall lay before our Ey's the perfect State and lasting Polity of the Catholique Church.

Now there is nothing more evident in the Apostolical and Primitive History, than that when the Apostles in pursuance of their Commission dispers'd themself's into all Parts of the World to preach the Gospel

Gospel and erect Churches, every man govern'd and presid'd over the Churches of his own Foundation. Hence St. *Paul's* Visiting his own Churches, *Acts* 15. 36. Hence his particular Care of Discipline in the Church of *Corinth*; so that whereas the Author of the Commentaries ascrib'd to St. *Ambrose* affirm's that Schism's were fomented in that Church by the Presbyters, *Quia adhuc Rectores Ecclesiis non omnibus locis fuerant constituti*, *Becaus as yet Governors were not settled in all Churches*, it is Evident by those Epistles, and particularly his Injunction to excommunicate the incestuous *Corinthian*, (1 *Cor.* 5. 4.) that the Apostle exercis'd this Authority himself, as he did over other Churches of his own planting, till by degrees settled Governors were fix'd in all Churches, as is plainly pointed out by this Passage. Hence this Apostle's so frequent Epistles to his severall Churches, which are so many effects of his Episcopal Care over them, and I will freely grant (becaus men contend for it, tho I know not why, unless it be that they understand not what is to their purpose) that in most of the Churches, to whom He directs his Epistles, there was no fix'd Bilhop; but tho there was not, Yet it is undenyable that the Apostle himself claimed and exercis'd Episcopal

Jurisdiction over them. Hence the Title of *St. Peter's* Epistle to the *Jews* of several Provinces, to whom he had preach'd the Gospel according to the agreement between him and *St. Paul*, *Gal. 2.9.* and over whom he presided as Supreme Governor. And as every Apostle was at first Bishop of the Churches of his own Plantation, so if any of them made their fix'd Residence in any particular City or Bishoprick, he became the proper Bishop of it, as it is evident in the Case of *St. James* of *Jerusalem*, by several Passages of the Scripture compar'd with the undoubted Records of the Church: hence his constant Residence there, from *St. Paul's* first coming to *Jerusalem*, to his last, which was 14 Years. Hence his precedency in Title, Honor and Authority above other Apostles, even *St. Peter* and *St. John*, *Gal. 2.9.* Hence his presiding in the Council of *Jerusalem*, for it is He that draws up the Decree, *Acts 15. 7, 13.* Hence *St. Peter's* Command when he was deliver'd out of Prison, that they should tell it to *James*, *Acts 12. 17.* Hence *St. Paul's* Address to him and his Presbyters at his last coming to *Jerusalem*, when there was no other Apostle residing there beside himself; and agreeable to these Passages *Ignatius* informs us, that *St. Stephen* was Deacon to this Bishop *James*, and

it

it is generally suppos'd that he govern'd that Church till about the sixth or seventh Year of *Nero*, when he was murder'd by *Ananus* the Younger ; but it is more probable from *Josephus*, that it was the fourth Year, it being done in the short Interval between the Death of *Festus* and the Arrival of his Successor *Albinus*, who continued there from the 4th till the 10th of that Emperor, which agrees exactly with *Epiphanius*, who affirms, that St. *James* presided over the Church of *Jerusalem* about 24 years after our Savior's Ascension. Antiq. l. 20. c. 8.

His Government of that Church is attested by *Hegeſippus* himself, who lived next to the first and Apostolical Age, *i. e.* to those who either were Apostles themselves, or convers'd with them, of whom St. *Polycarp* was the last, who suffer'd Martyrdom in the time of *M. Antoninus*, at which time *Hegeſippus* was in the Flower of his Age, and therefore living so near to the very time of the Apostles, and making it the Design and Employment of his Life to enquire into the most antient Records and original Practice of Churches, he cannot but be admitted for an unquestionable Witness of Apostolical Customs and Constitutions. And of the same Authority is the Testimony of St. *Clement* in the Sixt

Hæres. 78.

*Hist. Eccles.
lib. 2. c. 1.*

*Anno Chri-
sti 34. num.
286.*

Book of his *Institutions*, as he is quoted by *Eusebius*, where he expressly records, that *tho Peter, James (the Great) and John were prefer'd by the Lord, Yet after his Assumption they did not challenge the Pre-rogative to themselv's, but chose James the Just, Bishop of Jerusalem.* That is, saith *Baronius*, after the usual modesty of the Romanists, he was chosen by *St. Peter*, Prince of the Apostles, and hath the confidence to prove it by this Passage, tho in it other Apostles are expressly joyn'd in Equal Authority with him. And the truth is, after the same rate of boldness, do these men impose upon all the Writings of the Antients. Insomuch that there is not one Citation produc'd by them out of the Writers of the first 300 Years (to go no lower) for the Popes Supremacy, that is not impudently strein'd or perverted; but that by the Way.

Now though these Constitutions were not written by *Clemens* the Famous Bishop of *Rome*, as plainly appears by the last Apostolical Canon, (where *Clemens* his two Epistles are ascrib'd to that Eminent Bishop, but the Constitutions to another *Clemens* who owns himself Author of that very Collection of Canons) Yet who ever this *Clemens* was, he was a very ancient and an early writer, as appears by his

own account of himself, That he was
 ἐγγιστὰ τῇ Ἀποστολικῇ διαδοχῇ, next to the *Apud Euseb. lib. 6. c. 13.*
 Apostolical Succession: and as Dr. *Beveridge* hath very probably conjectur'd, in
 his Accurate and Learned Notes upon that
 Canon, it was *Clemens Alexandrinus*. For
 that he wrote a Book of Ecclesiastical Ca-
 nons (and so the Canons Apostolical were
 commonly call'd) is attested by the An-
 tients, *Eusebius*, *St. Jerom*, *Photius*. And
 for his *Book of Constitutions*, himself af-
 firms in the *Book of the Paschever*, That at
 the Importunity of his Friends he wrote
 such a Book for the Information of Poste-
 rity from the Tradition of the Antients.
 And this afterward gain'd the name of
Apostolical Constitutions, as the *Canons* did:
 not becaus they pretended to have bin
 fram'd by them, but becaus they were
 deriv'd by an uninterrupted Succession
 from them. And by those Fragments of
 the work, that are still remaining in the
 Antients, he seems to have made very
 great use of *Clement*, *Polycarp*, but especi-
 ally *Ignatius* for his Collection. Tho the
 Book that now goes under that Name is
 so wretchedly corrupt and debauch't, and
 not onely different from, but contrary to
 the Copy's cited by Antient Writers, that
 tho it is not altogether supposititious, yet
 becaus of its many, and uncertain Inter-
 polations

polations it is altogether useleſs. And for that reaſon it is rejected by the Sixth General Council in *Trullo*, in its ſecond Canon, becauſe interpolated by Heretiques. But that he compoſed ſuch a Book from the Traditions and the Writings of the Primitive Chriſtians, is evident from the Teſtimony of thoſe Learned Men that quote him; and particularly among the reſt the foremention'd Citation out of him by *Eusebius* is remarkable to our purpoſe, That St. *James* was not onely Biſhop of *Jeruſalem*, but was choſen to that Office by the Apoſtles themſelv's. But after all, *Eusebius* his own Teſtimony, though it had ſtood alone, and tho he liv'd at a good diſtance of time from it, is of it ſelf more than a Demonſtration, in that he hath given us an exact deſcription of all the Biſhops of *Jeruſalem* from St. *James* down to *Narciffus* the 30th Biſhop in that Succeſſion; partly from the Memoirs of antient Writers, partly from the Records of that Church it ſelf; To which I might add, That the very Epiſcopal Chair in which he ſat, according to the Cuſtom of thoſe firſt Ages, was to be ſeen in *Eusebius* his time, as he ſaith it was; for tho thoſe Shews are of no great weight in themſelv's, Yet they are no ſmall Argument of the conſtant Tradition of the Church, eſpecially

Lib. 4.
Lib. 5. c. 12.

Lib. 7. c. 19.

especially when they are joyn'd with so much other concurrent Evidence, and have no other design in them but plain truth and simplicity: So that it is not his own private Testimony, but both a constant Tradition and a public Register, upon which his Authority rely's; and how carefully the *Dypticks* or Succession of their Bishops from the Apostles were reserv'd in the *Archiv's* of the Apostolical Churches, is vulgarly known to all Persons of ordinary Learning. Now when the Testimonies of the most antient Writers suit so exactly with so many Passages of the holy Scriptures, and are vouch'd by publique and solemne Records, they are too wilful or too Sceptical that demand any further Satisfaction. And therefore to all this Evidence, it is a doughty Answer that is given us out of *Salmasius*, *That this were to degrade an Apostle to the Office of an ordinary Bishop.* For this is not to appeal to the Testimony of competent Witnesses, which is the onely Evidence of the matter of Fact, but to baffle it with a *Querke* of Logick. The most antient and undoubted Records of the Church unanimously set down *St. James* for the first Bishop of *Jerusalem*. No, say we,

Walo p. 201. Absurdum igitur illud Clementis Alexandrini commentum, qui Jacobum Apostolum ac proinde universalem Episcopum, in specialem et localem transmutare, et sic in ordinem cogere cogitavit.

we, that's impossible, *for that were to degrade an Apostle to a Bishop.* Of the Logick of the Argument afterwards; but at present what do we say to all these plain and undeniable Testimonies? If we admit them, in spite of all the Logick in the World it is certain that he was Bishop of *Jerusalem*: if we reject them, we must upon the same terms throw away all the Records in the World, not only private but publick, and that when they both agree, without any other historical Counter-Evidence or Exception. But then as for the Argument, it is so far from being an Absurdity, that it is an undeniable Truth, That the Apostolical Office was Episcopal, and the Episcopal Apostolical, both of them consisting in the Supreme Government of the Church; so that an Apostle was a moving Bishop to found Churches, and a Bishop a settled Apostle to govern them. And therefore *St. James* not travelling abroad, but residing constantly at *Jerusalem*, and exercising his Apostolical Authority there, was truly and properly their fix'd Bishop. And thus even the great *Walo* himself after a great deal of *Leviathan* tumbling about the difference between the name of Apostle and Bishop, and guessing that this *James* was onely a Presbyter, and none of the 12 Apostles,

Apostles, concludes that he was accounted of, as Bishop of that City, *Quia Presbyterio hoc est Cœtui Episcoporum sive Presbyterorum in illâ Civitate constituto cum auctoritate majore præfuit. Becaus he was placed in an higher Authority over the Presbytery or Clergy of that City.* And what can any reasonable Man desire more to prove his Episcopal Supremacy in it ? So that whether he were an Apostle that by Virtue of his fix'd Residence there, became Bishop of that Church ; or whether being onely a Presbyter, he was advanc'd to a Superiority of Power above the other Presbyters, it is all that we need to prove, or he to grant.

§. II. And now when the Apostolical Supremacy is so evident in this first Age of the Christian Church, one would think after that, there would remain no Controversy about the Equality of Ecclesiastical Officers for their time, when this thing alone so plainly prevents and anticipates the very Dispute it self. And yet notwithstanding that this is unanimously granted, it is voluminously disputed by the pretended followers of *St. Jerom*, that there was then no inequality, only from the promiscuous signification of the words *Bishop* and *Presbyter*. Which is to argue
both

both againſt their own Conceſſion, and the undenyable Evidence of matter of Fact; viz. that though it is confeſſed that in the Apoſtles time there was an Inequality of Church Power, yet it is deny'd that there was any, becauſe there are ſome words common to all Perſons, in whom any ſhare of this Power reſides. And tho I have elſewhere ſhewn the folly of this trifling, very briefly, yet more than it deſerves, I ſhall now conſider it more largely, becauſe I find it ſtill ſo eagerly inſiſted upon as the moſt artificial and plauſible Argument to amuſe the common People. And I ſhall treat it with all the favor and kindneſs I can, and then leave it to its own ſelf to diſcover its own weakneſs and vanity, and that certainly is a lamentable Cauſe that no Civility will help out. And therefore tho ſome Learned men to bridle our Adverſaries great Preſumption, are pleas'd to put them upon the proof of the Community of the names *Biſhop* and *Probyter* in the Apoſtles time, (and the truth is, if it ſhould be deny'd them, they have no better proof for it than remote and uncertain gueſſes) yet becauſe nothing of the Controverſy depends upon it, and becauſe, if at all rely'd upon, it would rather be an Injury than an Advantage to my Cauſe, by mixing ſome

Dr. Ham-
mond diſs.

A. C. 10.

Dr. Pear-
ſon Vind.

Ign. —
part poſt
c. 13.

some uncertainty with it, (for if it be uncertain that the Names were promiscuously used, so it is that they were not) I shall therefore quit them of this Difficulty, and freely grant them not onely this, but all the Advantage that themself's ever claim'd from the Apostolical History.

And therefore I will not dispute it with *Walo* and *Blondel*, whether the Presbyters at *Miletus*, whom *St. Paul* calls Bishops, belong'd to the Church of *Ephesus* onely, *Acts* 20. or were summon'd out of the several adjoining City's. Tho I must confess that *Irenæus* expressly affirms that both Bishops and Presbyters were conven'd from *Ephesus* and the Adjoining City's : and *St. Jerom* himself affirms, that there were in *Asia* divers Bishops in the Apostles time, at whose request *St. John* writ his *Apocalypse*. So that if *Irenæus* that liv'd so near the Apostles, Scholar to *Polycarp*, who was made Bishop of *Smyrna* by the Apostles, be a competent Witness of a thing so publique, and so near his own time, then it is certain that not onely the Clergy of that City, but of that Province, of which *Ephesus* was the *Metropolis*, attended the Apostle at *Miletus* ; And if *St. Jerom* may be trusted, there were then several Bishops among them. And that it was not the Clergy of a single City, but

P. 10.

Acts 20.
17.*Lib.* 3. c. 14.in *Catal.*

but of a whole Country, looks very probable from the Address of St. Paul's Speech, in which he declares, that he had continued in *Asia* three years together, and appeals not to the Clergy of *Ephesus*, but of all *Asia* concerning the Innocence of his Life and Conversation among them. Yet notwithstanding all this, I will grant that they were only the Presbyters of *Ephesus*, and all that can be inferred from it is, that there were Presbyters in that City, but doth it therefore follow that they were Vested with a Supremacy over the Churches in it? This were to contradict the Apostles own Proceedings among them, for that they were subject to his Authority is evident from the Summons he sends them, and the Charge he gives them. He cites them from *Ephesus* to attend him at *Miletus*, and strictly enjoyns them to be faithful in the Performance of their respective Duties. So that if at that time there were no Bishop set over them, the Apostle was their Bishop, who now taking his last solemn farewell of them, leaves *Timothy* Supreme Governour of that Church in his stead; for it was in this *Macedonian* journey that he fixed *Timothy* there, 1 Tim. 1. 3; *I besought thee to abide still at Ephesus when I went into Macedonia.* And therefore though we find *Timothy* a Companion

on of *St. Paul* in this Voyage, yet after the Apostle's departure from *Miletus*, we find no more mention of him in all the Acts of the Apostles. But at whatever time he was appointed to preside over that Church, and how long soever he continued his Residence in it, it is certain that as *St. Paul* exercised Supremacy of Power over it himself, so he settled him in the same Authority, particularly of Ordaining the Clergy; so plainly do we find in this very Text, with which our Innovators make so much noise, the true Primitive Form of Church Government, a Bishop presiding in it over the Presbyters.

As for *Phil. I. I.* where the Epistle is directed to the Bishops and Deacons, without the mention of any intermediate Presbyters, and therefore the Bishops of that Church were no more than Presbyters, because many in a City. I will not be so severe as to put them to prove that the See might not be vacant at that time, or that *Epaphroditus* their Bishop was not at that time absent, or that there might not be different Churches of Jews and Gentiles in that, as well as in some other Cities, or that *Philippi* was not a Metropolis, so that in it, all the Bishops of the Province might be included; all which may be rationally presum'd in a particular Case, oppos'd to the universal Practice

ctice of the Church, and the Supposition
 of any of them is enough to abate and turn
 the Edge of their Confidence. But I will
 grant that the Bishops or Overseers here
 mentioned were proper Presbyters; but
 then I must demand of our Adversaries,
 that in Requital they will yield that these
 Presbyters were subject to the Apostles,
 and after that, let them make what Ad-
 vantage of the Text they please. As for
 our parts we are certain, that *St. Paul* was
 the Founder of that Church, the History
 whereof is Recorded, *Acts* 16. And there-
 fore whatever Presbyters were set over it,
 they were placed there by his Authority;
 and subject to it at the very time of the
 writing this Epistle: And here (by the
 way) it is observable, that though he was
 then in Prison at *Rome*, it is written with
 an extraordinary vigour and alacrity of
 Expression, from that particular Delight
 and Satisfaction he took in the great Con-
 fidence and Sincerity of their Faith; which
 was so much the firmer, as being founded
 upon two plain and publick Miracles, which
 being taken notice of by the Magistrates,
 made their Certainty absolutely unques-
 tionable; however that was, *St. Paul* was
 their Bishop, as the Apostles for some time
 kept to themselves the Episcopacy, or Su-
 preme Government of the Churches of
 their

their own Foundation. And therefore this Church is reckon'd by *Tertullian* among the Apostolical Churches, that is, as himself defines them, those Churches over which some Apostle was known to have presided, *Apud quas ipsæ adhuc Cathedræ Apostolorum suis locis præsident.* So that the Bishop of that Church in *Tertullian's* time was known to have succeeded the Apostle in that See, as now one Bishop doth another; and what *Tertullian* means by that is evident, in that he reckons up three Orders of the Clergy, Bishop, Priest, and Deacon; and gives such a Supremacy to the Bishop, as to allow nothing to be done in the Church by Presbyters or Deacons without his Authority; * so that when he speaks of a certain Succession of Bishops to the Apostles, in the Government of any Church, it is certain that he means proper Bishops, as superior to the other Clergy, who by Succeeding in an Apostolical See, succeeded in their Apostolical Authority.

De Baptismo, cap. 17. Dandi quidem habet jus summus sacerdos quæ est Episcopus; de hinc Presbyteri & Diaconi, non tamen sine Episcopo.

pi Autoritate, propter Ecclesiæ honorem; quo salvo salva pax est.

But again, the same Persons are stiled **P. 12.** Bishops and Presbyters, *1 Tim. 3. 2. Titus 1. 5, 7.* So they are, but then they are subject to *Timothy*, and *Titus*, as well as the Deacons with whom they are joined. For that is the very Argument of those Epistles

stles to direct them how to govern the Churches over which they presided, and particularly the Clergy. So that without a Superiority in *Timothy* and *Titus* over the other two Orders, the Epistles are Nonsense, and instruct Men to govern without Authority : but with it we have apparently the three Orders of the Clergy settled in those Churches.

As for *Heb. 13. 7.* The ἡγούμενοι there mention'd, may be either Bishops or Presbyters or both, for any thing that can be collected from the words themselves. And therefore it is mere Confidence in *Blondel*, from thence to infer that the Church of *Jerusalem* was govern'd by a common Council of Presbyters. Why so ? Why not as well by a Bishop and Presbyters, as we certainly know it was. But what is this Epistle to the Church of *Jerusalem* ? It is not directed to them, but to all the *Jews* in the World. Now cannot the Apostle exhort them to be obedient to their Spiritual Guides and Governours wherever they reside, but there must be presently an *Assembly of Divines* at *Jerusalem*. Upon such intollerable Presumptions as these doth the Presbyterian Cause subsist. But any thing will serve the turn to abuse men, that are resolv'd to abuse themselves.

And

And lastly, As for those Passages in the Acts of the Apostles, concerning the Presbyters of *Jerusalem* join'd with the Apostles, I cannot understand what follows from them, but this, That in that Church there were Presbyters subject to the Apostles ; And therefore I would not accept of that Plea, if it could be made good, which is insisted upon by some learned men. That in these several Texts are not meant the Presbyters of one City, but the Bishops of the Province of *Judea* met together in Council with the Apostles in the Metropolitan Church of *Jerusalem*, which tho it may be possible, is yet very improbable, in that there is no foot-step of any Record that in those early days of Christianity, there were any fixed Episcopal Seats in all *Judea* beside *Jerusalem* ; And withal, the Presbyters here mentioned were fixed and constant in that Church, as is evident from *Act. 21.19.* at *St. Paul's* second coming to *Jerusalem*, when there was no Apostle then residing there, but onely *St. James* the Bishop, the very next day after his Arrival it is said, That *he went unto James, and all the Elders were present.* And therefore they must reside in the City, for there was not sufficient time to Summon them from all Parts of the Country. And therefore the Enemies

of Episcopal Superiority are so far from gaining any Advantage to their Cause by proving these Presbyters Assembled at *Jerusalem* to be no Bishops, that it is a plain demonstration of the true Primitive Government of the Church from clear and express Apostolical Practice, *viz.* A Bishop, with his Subject Presbyters residing in the City or Church of *Jerusalem*.

But if after all this, men will still persist in it, as *Walo* doth without end, that if the Offices were distinct to demand the reason of the Community of the names, I might reply with *Theodoret*, because the distinction was signified by other names, the name of Apostle being appropriate to the Supreme Order: But because I have already treated with *Walo* about that Passage out of *Theodoret*, which though he alledges in the first place as the most pertinent Testimony in all the Ancients for his cause, is yet the clearest baffle that could have been put upon it; for it declares first an Inequality in Church-Officers under the Apostles; Secondly, that the Bishops properly so call'd, succeeded the Apostles in their Apostolical Authority; Thirdly, that the reason why the names *Bishop* and *Presbyter* were not distinguished in the Apostles own time, was because the Office of a Bishop was then expressed

pressed by the name of an Apostle ; and if that be so, it for ever puts to silence all their noise and out-cry from the Equivalency of those two names under the Apostles , because the Episcopal Superiority was then express'd by another name. But *Salmasius* being ever most confident when he is most in the wrong, as he made this Passage the foundation of his *Walo Messalinus*, so he has found out another just as awkward to his design, for the main flourish of his *Apparatus* to his Books *de Pri-* P. 40.
matu, which was written in defence of his *Walo*, and that is out of his darling Author, the counterfeit *Ambrose* in his Commentaries upon the Epistles to *Timothy*, as he is quoted by *Amalaricus* ; where giving the reason why the names *Bishop* and *Presbyter* that were promiscuously used in the time of the Apostles, were afterward distinguished, he thus states it. *Beatis verò Apostolis decedentibus, illi qui post illos ordinati sunt ut præessent Ecclesiis, illis primis exæquari non poterant, neque miraculorum testimonium par illis habere, sed in multis aliis inferiores illis esse videbantur, grave illis videbatur Apostolorum sibi vindicare nuncupationem. Diviserunt ergo nomina ipsa, et iisdem Presbyteriorum nomen reliquerunt, alii verò Episcopi sunt nuncupati, hique Ordinationis præditi sunt*

Potestate, ita ut plenissimè iidem præpositi
 se Ecclesiarum esse cognoscerent. *The Blessed
 Apostles deceasing, those that were Ordain'd
 to preside over Churches after them, could not
 be Equall'd to those first, nor attain the like
 Gift of Miracles, but appearing inferior to
 them in many other things, thought it not
 decent to challenge to themselves the name
 of Apostles, and hereupon they divided the
 names, and left them the name of Presby-
 ters, (i. e. those that had both in the time
 of the Apostles) and the others were stiled
 Bishops, (i. e. those that presided over
 Churches after the Apostles) and these
 were endued with the Power of Ordaining,
 that they might know themselves to be set
 over the Churches in the fullest right. Up-
 on which observable Passage, though it
 would afford a great number of Remarks,
 I shall make no other than what I find
 the Judicious Mr. Thorndike has already
 made to my hand. ' I marvel (says he)*

*Review of
 the Right of
 the Church,
 pag. 77.*

what pleasure *Salmasius* had to alledge
 this Passage, which if it be admitted, is
 enough alone to overthrow all that he
 hath said in this Point. For first he sup-
 poseth, as the received Doctrine of the
 Church, that Bishops in their several
 Churches succeeded the Apostles. Se-
 condly, he answers all St. *Hierom's* Rea-
 sons; to prove that Bishops and Presby-
 ters

'ters are all one, because they are called
 'by the same name in the Scriptures, by
 'giving another reason, even that which
 'you have here. Lastly he saith, That
 'Bishops are set over their Churches *ple-*
 '*nissime*, in the fullest Right, and that
 'therefore Ordination was reserved to
 'them, which is to say, that in all things
 'they have a special interest, but especial-
 'ly Ordination is their peculiar. This
 one would think more then enough to
 satisfy the utmost demands that any in-
 genuous man could make for the cer-
 tain Apostolical Succession of Episco-
 pacy, and yet from this very passage
Salmasius proceeds to make the contra-
 ry conclusion (as he always does)
 blindfold. *Hæc clarissime demonstrant*
post Apostolorum demum obitum hanc
divisionem munerum & nominum esse fa-
ctam. This most evidently demonstrates
that it was after the death of the Apostles,
that this division both of the Offices and
Names was made. When it so evidently
 demonstrates that the Officers were di-
 stinguish't before, though the Name's not
 till afterwards, for it expressly places the
 Office in the Apostles, to which those that
 after them presid'd over Churches suc-
 ceeded, and though they took the new
 name of Bishop upon them, for the reason

assign'd, they bore the old Office of Apostles: what strange confidence then is it for *Salmasius* to infer from hence, that because the division of the Names was made after the Apostles, so was that of the Office too, when the passage so expressly avers that the Office was the same with that of the Apostles, and that those that were afterward stiled Bishops were their Successors. But this is *Salmasius* his standing juggle, to make every passage in which either of these two words Bishop or Presbyter occur a demonstration of the Identity of Office, only by tacking *munus & nomen* together: And thus, when this Authour says, That the Name was the same under the Apostles, but not the Office, he infers therefore both Name and Office. And if we bar him and his fellows but this one childish Sophism, they must in this controversie be dumb forever. It is the whole force of all that they have written upon it; all their Books are nothing more then this one thing repeated so many thousand times over, though it is so weak a Bul-rush for a sinking Cause to catch at, as plainly shews that it has nothing to support it. But after all, seeing *Salmasius* will insist upon the enquiry after the reason of the Identity of the Names in the time of the Apostles, I shall vouch.

vouchsafe no other Answer to so childish a Question than this, That when I went to School I learn'd from my Lexicon, that the word ἐπισκοπῆ signifies any sort of Power, Trust, or Government, a Captain in an Army, an Overseer of Workmen, a Mayor of a Corporation, a Master of a Quire; and particularly I remember out of my *Tully's Epistles*, that he saith of himself, that he was made Bishop of the Sea Ports, *Vult enim me Pompeius esse quem tota hæc maritima ora habeat ἐπισκοπον, id est, Speculatorem & Custodem.* And of the same nature and extent is the signification of the word πρεσβυτέρῳ, which at first imported Age, and because grave men were usually thought fittest for Government, it came at last to denote any manner of Power and Authority,

*Ad Attic.
lib. 7. Ep.
11.*

* and then no wonder if words of such a general signification be applicable to all kind of Offices how distant or different so ever. Especially in this Case, when there were two sorts of Ecclesiastical Offices in the Christian Church, the one Ministerial as that of Deacons, the other Authoritative as that of Bishops, and Presbyters, and therefore when they are to be describ'd so as to distinguish them from the other Inferiour and Ministerial Officers,

* *Nam apud omnes utique gentes honorabilis est senectus: unde & Synagoga & postea Ecclesia Seniores habuit, sine quo consilio nihil agebat in Ecclesia.* The Commentaries under St. *Ambrose's* Name, upon 1 *Tim.* 5. 1.

cers, it cannot be done otherwise than by Titles that signifie some Rule and Power. So that when we find sometimes Bishops and Deacons join'd in Scripture, sometimes Presbyters and Deacons; these words plainly signifie the whole ruling part of the Clergy, how much soever they may be distinguish'd among themselves. And therefore once for all, I will grant to *Walo* and his followers, that there might have been at that time a great variety of words comprehensive of both Orders, as distinct from Deacons, not onely that of *Presbyter* and *Episcopus*, but if he pleases to accept it, *πρεσβυς*, *Præpositus*, *Antistes*, *Pastor*, *ἡγούμενος*, or any other that expresse any share of Government in the Church, because it is certain that the Presbyters shared in it under the Bishops; and if from this community of Names they will infer an Equality of Power, I cannot help it. But then they must be oblig'd to conclude too, that there was then no difference between an Apostle and an ordinary Presbyter, because the very same Names were common to both. And yet what Volumes hath this one lean and forc'd Conclusion brought forth against the Apostolical Succession of Bishops? Nay 'tis the onely thing beside St. *Jerom's* rash expressions that supports the Controversie. Other-

therwise if they would but honestly appeal to the Evidence of matter of Fact it self (which is the onely proper Argument in this Cause) that alone would shamefully rebuke their folly, in that there is no instance of any Ancient Church, in which there were Presbyters without a Bishop, or an Apostle presiding over them. And that's an undeniable Evidence of the distinction of the Orders, notwithstanding that they then were, and still are comprehended under the same general Titles, because they both in their several Stations preside over the Flock. And if men would be but so ingenuous as to take notice of such an obvious Truth, that alone would put an end to this shadow of a Controversie. But when they are so often put in mind of it, and yet without any regard to it, persist in their Clamour, as some Writers at second hand out of *Walo* and *Blundel* have done of late, all that they can gain by it, beside abusing their own seduced Rabble, is to satisfie all understanding men, that themselves have renounced not only common sense, but common honesty. This is the true State of the First and Apostolical Age, in which the Apostles kept the Supremacy in their own hands over the Inferiour Clergy, sometimes fixing their Residence, and exercising their Authority

Vide Blondel, Apol. p. 135.

thority in a particular Church or City as St. *James* at *Jerusalem*, sometimes moving up and down to compleat Churches of their own Foundation; and so the profound *Walo* himself, after all his Expence of Glossary-ware hath stated the Case, that those Apostles who had no fixed Residence, but travell'd up and down to plant or confirm Churches, were stiled Apostles, but if any of them resided in any one City, he was call'd the Bishop of that City, as *James* of *Jerusalem*, who was placed there in Superior Authority over the other Clergy. *

■ Hæc enim
Apostoli
propria mis-
sio ac voca-

tio, ex ipso nomine munus ejus & officium significans, quo sedes uno in loco figere non debent, sed orbem peragrarè & perlustrare ad dei verbum & Evangelium prædicandum Hinc factum ut qui fixam stabilemque sedem in aliquâ provinciâ vel civitate haberent, populoque ejus provinciæ vel civitatis docendo vacarent, nec alio vagarentur, Apostolorum nomine vix essent nuncupandi. Hæc quippe appellatio missionem propriè significat, & professionem in alias atque alias regiones. Ideo Jacobus domini frater & Apostolus, quia Hierosolymis non abstinit, nec quoquam extra eam urbem pedem movit, Episcopus à veteribus appellatus est.

§. III. But because the stress of all their pretences lies in this Dichotomy (as *Blondel* calls it) or division of the Clergy into two Orders, I shall give a fuller account of it out of the Writings of the Ancients, whereby it will appear that those who first divided it into two, the Ministerial and Authoritative, afterward sub-divided the Authoritative into a first and second Order, and that will clear both the reason and

and the nature of the first division : which was nothing else but the great distance of the Ministerial Order from the other two, and their nearness to each other. And in the first place it is very observable that this gave the first occasion to this Controversie in St. *Jerom's* time, when the contest between the Presbyters and Deacons at *Rome* run so high, that the Deacons claim'd not only equal dignity to, but superiority over the Presbyters, as both St. *Jerom* and the Author of the Questions upon the Old and new Testament informs us, who both lived at the same time, and wrote upon the same occasion : This, I say, was the particular provocation that rais'd St. *Jerom's* choler so high against them, and the more effectually to beat them down, he lets them know that the Presbyters stand in the same Priesthood with the Bishop, whereas themselves were little more then Servants in the Church, and appointed to wait upon them in their several Offices. The State of the whole matter was this : That whereas the Deacons had under the Bishops the disposal of the Offerings, *i. e.* at that time the Revenue of the Church, where the Church was wealthy, that gave them great dignity in the Opinion of the World, and false honour naturally swells it self into insolence ;

lence; so that in the Records of the Church
 we find them at every turn juggling with
 the Presbyters for Place and Authority.
 In the Eighteenth Canon of the Council
 of *Nice*, it was complained of to the holy
 Synod, "That in some Places and Cities
 "the Deacons presumed to give the Eu-
 "charist to the Presbyters, which neither
 "the Law nor the Custom of the Church
 "will allow of, that those who have not
 "the Power of Consecration, should give
 "our Saviour's Body to those that have.
 "And withal it is inform'd, That some
 "Deacons are so bold as to Officiate the
 "Eucharist even before Bishops themselves.
 "Therefore it is Enacted, That all these
 "things be reformed, and that Deacons keep
 "within their own bounds, remembring
 "that they are the Bishops Servants, and the
 "Presbyters Inferiours. Let them there-
 "fore receive the Eucharist after the Pres-
 "byters in their Order from the hands of
 "a Bishop or a Presbyter, neither let them
 "presume to sit among the Bench of
 "Presbyters, it is both against Canon and
 "Order. Whoever therefore obeys not
 "this Constitution, let him be deposed.
 Whereby we see both the Sense and the
 Custom of the Ancient Church, concern-
 ing the distance between Deacons and
 the Orders of Bishop and Priest, resembling
 that

that, as they represent it between Servants and Masters, and so the Greek Scholiasts gloss upon it, *οἱ μὲν γὰρ δουλοῦνται, οἱ δὲ δουλοῦσι*, *These wait, and these are waited upon.* The Government of the Church was reserved so entirely to the Bishop and his Bench of Presbyters, that it was not so much as lawful for any Deacon to sit among them, and that is the known Custom of the Primitive Church, that about the holy Altar the Bishop sat in his Throne, and his Presbyters on each hand upon lower Seats, into which it was not lawful for Lay-men, but only Consecrated Persons to enter, and though the Deacons were admitted into the place at Divine Service, yet were they obliged to stand in presence of the Sacred Bench in token of Subjection. But notwithstanding this we find them frequently forgetting their duty and good manners, and thrusting themselves into the Priestly Consistory, and as frequently Check't and repulsed for it, as by the Council of *Nice* in the fore-mentioned Canon, so of *Laodicea* Canon the 20th. of *Carthage* 6. C. 18. of *Arles*. 1 C. 18. 2 C. 15. And this presumption of the Deacons, particularly at *Rome* lasted so long that Pope *Gelasius*, who succeeded in the Year 492, was constrained to Publish a Decree forbidding
all

all Deacons to Sit in the presence of the Presbytery. But the Bickerings between them were highest about *St. Jeroms* time, insomuch that Pope *Anastasius* was forced to publish a Decree to Command the Presbyters to stand up at the holy Gospels, for whereas it had ever been the custom for all present to stand at the reading of the Gospel by the Deacons, yet because the Deacons would presume to Sit among the Presbyters, before whom they were bound to stand, they combin'd not to rise up at the Gospel, that they might keep their Prerogative of Sitting, when the Deacons were forced to be standing by the nature of the Office it self, upon which *Anastasius* was fain to Issue forth his *Mandate* to prevent the Enormity. The two things that heightned the Pride of the *Roman* Deacons were their Paucity and their Wealth, they were but Seven in number in that as well as all other Churches after the example of the Church of *Jerusalem*, whereas the Presbyters were much more numerous, *Cornelius* reckons up no less then 46 in his time, which number could not but be much increased by the time of *St. Jerom*, who gives this reason for the advantage of the Deacons against the Presbyters. *Quid paucitatem, de qua ortum est supercilium in leges Ecclesiæ vindicas? Omne quod rarum est,*

est, plus appetitur. Pulegium apud Indos pipare pretiosus est. Diaconos paucitas honorabiles, presbyteros turba contemptibiles facit.

But the main thing that advanced their power and dignity was the disposal of the Revenue of the Church, especially from the time of Pope *Fabian*, who if we may believe the pontifical Book divided the 14 Regions of the City of *Rome* among the Seven Deacons, allotting to each Deacon two Regions, from whence they were styled *Diaconi Regionarii*, and afterward by the pretended Council at *Rome* under Pope *Silvester*, *Cardinales. Concil. Rom. 2. c. 7.* Though long before that time they were arrived to a great height, especially the Arch-Deacon, that is the first of the Deacons, who was Master and Keeper of the Treasury, and from hence it was that they so frequently succeeded in the Papacy, and carried the Election from the Presbyters, *Eleutherus* the Arch-Deacon succeeded *Anicetus*, and *Soter*, even in *Hegesippus* his time, but before and at *St. Jeroms* time they swept all away, the Popes and Anti-Popes were both of the Order of Deacons, as *Liberius*, and *Felix*, *Damasus* and *Ursicinus*, no wonder then if when they carried the whole sway of the Church they lift their heads so high, and it was under *Damasus* that *Falcidius*

Euseb. l. 4. c. 22.

their Chieftain made the publick demand of preheminance above the Presbyters, of which *St. Jerom* being inform'd by Letter from *Rome*, it drew from him in answer to it that warm and famous Epistle to *Evagrius*. *Audire quendam* (says he) *in tantam erupisse vecordiam, ut Diaconos Presbyteris, i. e. Episcopis anteferebat.* I am informed of some body, that he is arrived to that degree of Confidence, as to prefer Deacons before Presbyters, *i. e.* before Bishops. For when the Apostle teaches you to be the same, who can endure that the Servant of Tables and Widows should swell himself above those, at whose Prayers Christs Body and Bloud are made, and then reckons up the several Texts of Scripture, in which the words *Bishop* and *Presbyter* are promiscuously used. From whence it appears that all *St. Jerom's* real design (setting aside his heat and passion) was to shew, and in his way to prove, That Presbyters are reckoned together with Bishops, as partakers in the same Christian Priesthood, whereas Deacons are thrust down into a lower degree and capacity, and therefore always ranged apart from them in the Apostolical Writings. And this nearness of the Presbyters to the Bishops he shews in this instance, *Quid enim facit excepta Ordinatione Episcopus quod non faciat*

faciat Presbyter. For what does a Bishop do that a Presbyter cannot do except Ordination ? So that a Presbyter approaching so near a Bishop in the Authoritative exercise of all the Offices of the Church, excepting only that of Ordination, it is no wonder if they are joined and reckoned together, to distinguish them from the Office of Deacons, that was at first merely Ministerial, and erected only to relieve the higher Orders from attending upon the lower Offices of the Church. So that St. *Jerom's* real Opinion, as he intended it in Opposition to the Insolence of the Deacons, was apparently the same with St. *Chrysostom's*, and the *Greek Fathers*. For so St. *Chrysostom* in his second Homily upon the first of *Timothy* and

the third Chapter, states it. Asking the question why the same Rules are prescribed by the Apostle to the Bishops and Presbyters in common, and other distinct Rules to the Deacons apart, his answer is

because the difference between them is not great, for Presbyters also take upon them both the Authority of teaching and governing the Church, so that whatever things the Apostle said concerning Bishops,

Τί δή ποτε; ὅτι ἔ ποτε τὸ μέσον αὐτῶν, καὶ ἡ Ἐπισκοπία. καὶ γὰρ καὶ αὐτοὶ διδασκαλίαν εἶσιν ἀναδεχόμενοι, καὶ προστάται τῆς Ἐκκλησίας. καὶ ἀπὸ Ἐπισκόπων εἶπε, ταῦτα καὶ Πρεσβυτέροις ἀρμόττει. τῇ γὰρ Χειροτονίᾳ μόνῃ ὑποβεβήκασι, καὶ τέτω μόνῳ δοκῶσι πλεονεκτεῖν τὰς Πρεσβυτέρας.

the same agree to Presbyters. For the Bishops are only superiour to them in the power of Ordination, and in this one thing alone do they seem to have a peculiar, or paramount Power above the Presbyters. The very same account this with St. *Jerom's*, and nothing more evident from the Records of the Primitive Church then this, that the Presbyters shared with the Bishop in all other acts of Authority, save only of Ordination. And it is the most common notion among all the Fathers, that though they constantly reckon up three Orders of the Clergy, yet distinguish the other two as something more Sacred, and of a distinct nature, and higher quality then that of Deacons. But in the next place St. *Jerom* proceeds to object to himself the Custom at *Rome*, where it seems the Deacons were wont to give their Testimonials at the Ordination of Presbyters; and rejects it with great scorn and indignation, not without some severe reflexion upon the pride of that City, as a thing absurd and singular. And at last fully and distinctly explains his meaning, when he concludes, that the Apostles in their Institutions had a regard to the forms under the Old Testament; so that what *Aaron* and his Sons, and the *Levites* were in the Temple, that let Bishops, Presbyters,

ters, and Deacons know themselves to be in the Church. Whereby he expressly derives these three Orders in the Christian Church from the Apostles themselves, and only places the two highest apart from the third, as *Aaron* and his Sons were always join'd together in the Priesthood, as distinct and separate from the *Levites*. This is so apparently *St. Jerom's* meer design, that nothing but gross and wilful dissimulation could pervert his meaning for one or two lavish and unwary expressions, not only against his argument but himself, who more then once distinguish'd between the *Sacerdotes primi & secundi*.

And as for their other great Man, whom they value next to *St. Jerom*, the Author of the Questions upon the Old and New Testament in *St. Austin* (the same with the Counterfeit *Ambrose* upon *St. Paul's* Epistles, as *Blondel* not improbably conjectures from the likeness of his Stile and Notion) his meaning is apparently the same with *St. Jeroms*, and from him we have a more exact account of the Controversy. For first he propounds the state of the question as it was managed at that time. 'What is to be answer'd to those
' Roman Levites, that contend to equal
' Levites to Priests, and Deacons to Pres-
' byters. And in the next place after a

Preface of the extravagance and novelty
 of the Opinion, he is the only man that
 informs us by whom it was started and
 maintain'd, none *Falcidius*, that (he says)
 was instigated to it by his own folly and
 the Pride of the City of *Rome*; And then
 overwhelms him with variety of weighty
 and pregnant Arguments. First he asks
 'by what Law, what Custom, what Ex-
 'ample, those that had not so much as
 'leave to sit in the Church, should be
 'equall'd to those, that because they were
 'the Priests of God, [*Antistites Dei*] sit
 'with Dignity in the house of God. What
 'boldness is it to level Presbyters with
 'their Ministers? What rash Presumption
 'to compare the Porters of the Taberna-
 'cle, the Scourers of Vessels and Dishes,
 'the Carriers of Water with the Priests
 'themselves? For this was the Office of
 'the *Levites*; and it is the same thing as
 'if they should equal Officers to their
 'Governors, and Servants to their Ma-
 'sters: For so the *Levites* were appointed
 'by Divine Command to be to their Priests,
 '*Numb.* 8. 13. which Custom is still ob-
 'served in the Church. And although
 'the Deacons of the Church of *Rome* are
 'less modest then others, yet they do not
 'presume to take to themselves the honour
 'of sitting in the Church. But because
 'for-

' forsooth they are Officers of the Church
 ' of *Rome*, therefore would they be thought
 ' greater men than in other Churches, be-
 ' cause of the Grandeur of the City, that
 ' may indeed pass for the head of all Cities.
 ' But if it be so, then ought they to chal-
 ' lenge the same Pre-eminence to their
 ' Presbyters. For if those that are Inferi-
 ' ours are advanced by the greatness of the
 ' City, how much more ought their Bet-
 ' ters to rise? For whatsoever honour is
 ' confer'd upon the Under-Officers is an
 ' accession to the Government, as the ho-
 ' nour of a Servant redounds to the glory
 ' of his Master. And then to raise the
 ' Argument higher, he adds, That a Priest
 ' is a Bishop *St. Paul* proves, when he in-
 ' structs *Timothy*, whom he Ordain'd a Pres-
 ' byter, how to Ordain Bishops, for what
 ' is a Bishop but the first Presbyter, that is,
 ' the High-Priest? And lastly, he urges
 ' that the Apostle calls them his Fellow-
 ' Presbyters, and do you think he would
 ' call the Deacons his Fellow-Deacons? By
 ' no means, because they are of a much low-
 ' er rank, it is as absurd as to call a Register
 ' a Judge. And in *Ægypt* if there be no
 ' Bishop a Presbyter confirms. And so pro-
 ' ceeds to shew the dignity of the Sacerdo-
 ' tal Order above the Levitical, by divers
 ' passages out of the Old Testament. Now

I pray what can be more evident from the Tenour of this whole discourse, then the Parallel between the Orders in the Christian Church, and the Priests and Levites in the Jewish? and though he places the Presbyters in the same Priesthood with the Bishop, it is after the same manner that the Priests were ranked with the High-Priest in opposition to the Levites; so that he levels the Bishop with the Presbyters, no more then he does the High-Priest with the Common Priests, and that manifestly overthrows all *Blondel's* Pleas for Equality; and when that is done, we care not whether the distance between a Bishop and a Presbyter be gradual or specifick, whether in kind or in order; for whatever the difference may be in Logick (which we leave to Children and Schoolmen, and Mr. B. to dispute among themselves,) it is enough to our purpose, and all that the Ancients regarded, that a Bishop differ'd so much from an ordinary Presbyter that the τὸ ὑπὲρ τῶν γινομένων, as the *Greeks* express it, was so much in him that nothing could be done by the other Presbyters, without him or his consent, and that difference being once granted, our learned Adversaries may dispute as long as they please about Genus and Species. And as for the Argument whereby
this

this ancient Author undertakes to prove a Presbyter so much Superiour to a Deacon, because the Apostles sometimes give themselves the Title of Fellow-Presbyters, but never of Brother-Deacons, *Blondel* is so well satisfied with it, as from thence to infer the Superiority of a Presbyter to a Deacon, as well he may, but when he proceeds to infer his Equality to a Bishop by being made equal to an Apostle, he cuts the throat of his own Argument, by overthrowing the Superiority of an Apostle to a Presbyter, so rash and inconsiderate are these men in the prosecution of their Cause, that they are ever running themselves upon Precipices in its over-eager pursuit; how else could *Blondel* after he had infer'd a thousand times over, that Bishops are call'd Presbyters in Scripture, and therefore they are of equal Authority; insist upon it that Apostles too are call'd Presbyters, and that by themselves, from whence what follows by his inference but the equality of every ordinary Presbyter with an Apostle? But if it does not follow (as no man dares to deny a Superiority in the Apostolical Office) then there is an end of the Argument for ever, and of Presbytery with it, that has nothing else to subsist upon then this poor, forced, and precarious inference. However it is manifest

nifest from this Ancient Writer, and the Confession of *Blondel* himself, that when the Ancients rankt Presbyters with Bishops and Apostles, it was in Opposition to the Deacons, whom they excluded out of the proper Christian Priesthood, as much as the Levites were shut out of the Jewish, though when they had done so, they made the same distinction in the Christian Priesthood between the Bishop and Presbyters, that was always observed in the Jewish Hierarchy between the High-Priest and the other ordinary Priests. And though the Deacons were afterward reckoned into the *Munia Sacerdotalia*, and placed in *Superioribus Ordinibus Ecclesiæ*, as opposed to the Under-Officers of the Church, Readers, Singers, Sub Deacons, &c. Yet that was of later date, and the Priesthood was taken in a loose sense, as comprising all holy Orders; and those very Authors that admit them into it in this lax sense, shut them out of it when they discourse strictly and accurately about it; for the thing they unanimously made proper to the Priesthood, was the power of Consecrating and Offering the Sacrifice of the Cross, from which Office the Deacons were excluded. But to proceed with *Blondel*, it is pleasant to observe how he says all things backward or forward as they

they serve his own turn. When he has P. 7.
observed at the beginning of his Book,
that the Apostles call'd themselves Presby-
ters but never Deacons, and from thence
concludes the Supremacy of Presbyters in
the Church, yet now in his notes upon the P. 62.
same Argument, as it is managed by the
Author of the Questions, he says, it will
not hold, because there are Instances of
Bishops, who writing to Deacons, some-
time call them Fellow-Priests, and Fellow-
Deacons. But the Instances he alledges are
so far from being in or near the Apostles
time, that they are of no earlier date, then
S. Austin, St. Basil, Optatus and *St. Jerom* :
Authors that sometimes take them in, and
sometimes shut them out, according to
the strict or lax acceptation of the Word.
Sometime dividing the Clergy, into three
Orders of Bishop, Presbyter and Deacon,
stiled by *Optatus Primum, Secundum, Ter-*
tium Sacerdotium, and sometimes into two, L. I. con-
the *Sacerdotes* and *Ministri*, *ἐπεὶς* and *Διάκ-* tra Parmen.
νοι, so *Sozomen* says, that *Constantine* carried Hist. l. I.
along with him to his Wars, a Taberna- c. 8.
cle in form of a Church, and *ἐπεὶς καὶ Διάκνοι*
to perform all Christian Offices. And as
the Ancients frequently divide the Officers
of the Church into *Sacerdotes* and *Mini-*
stri, so do they as commonly subdivide
the *Sacerdotes* into the higher and lower
Stations,

Com. in Jer.
tom. c. 13.

Stations, as St. Jerom calls the Presbyters, *Sacerdotes secundi in honore Ecclesiastico gradus*, and so in his Book, *Adversus Lucifer. Ecclesie salus in summi Sacerdotis dignitate pendet, aliter tot Schismata essent quot Sacerdotes*: by the *Summus Sacerdos*, meaning the Bishop, and by the *Sacerdotes* the Priests or Presbyters. And in his Epitaph upon Paula, *aderant Hierosolymorum et aliarum Urbium Episcopi, et Sacerdotum inferioris gradus, ac Levitarum innumerabilis multitudo*. So Constantine writing to Chrestus Bishop of Syracuse, to repair to the Council of Arles, he bids him bring along with him two $\tau\omega\iota\varsigma \epsilon\kappa \tau\omicron\varsigma \Delta\epsilon\upsilon\tau\epsilon\rho\omicron\upsilon \theta\rho\omicron\tau\omicron\varsigma$ of the second Order i. e. Presbyters. More Instances of this thing may be seen in Valefius his Notes upon the place. But in short there is no one notion more trite among the Ancients, that held an inequality between Bishops and Presbyters, then to join them together in the Priesthood in opposition to the Deacons or Ministry. As will appear from most of the following citations alledged by Blondel, that have no other force in them then this, that the Clergy are sometimes divided into two Orders, and that even by those very men, who subdivide them into three, and therefore (as Blondel all along inferrs) there are no more then two. St. Cyprian may

Euseb. hist.
l. 10. c. 5.

may serve as an Instance for all, for though none of the Ancients have more frequently recited the three Orders of Bishop, Priest and Deacon, yet notwithstanding that do we often find him (as *Blondel* speaks) dichotomising. *Ep.* 62.

Cum omnes omnino disciplinam tenere oporteat, multo magis Præpositos et Diaconos curare hoc fas est. *Ep.* 72. *Oportet Sacerdotes et Ministros integros esse.* And in his

Book, *de Lapsis. Non in Sacerdotibus Religio devota, non in Ministris fides integra,* with divers other Instances of the same Nature, collected by *Blondel*, pag. 43.

Now from hence to infer, that *S. Cyprian* knew but two Orders, though in every Page of his Writings he mentions three, is, as I take it, an Inference somewhat too bold, especially when in the chief passage here alledged by him, *St. Cyprian* expressly subdivides the Sacerdotal Order into Bishop and Presbyter. *Nec hoc in Episcoporum tantum et Sacerdotum, sed in Diaconorum Ordinationibus observasse Apostolos animadvertimus.* *Quod utique idcirco tam diligenter et cautè convocatâ plebe totâ gerebatur, ne quis ad Altaris Ministerium vel ad Sacerdotalem locum obreperet.* Where he

expressly distinguishes the Ministerial from the Sacerdotal Office, and divides the Sacerdotal, between the Bishop and Presbyter

ter or Priest strictly so called. Let us but barr *Blondel* this litle Piece of disingenuity, to infer not only against all the Laws of Logick but of Arithmetick, and there is a full Answer to his Voluminous Apologie.

§. IV. This then being the State of the Church under the Apostles, the next thing to be inquir'd into is, in what condition they left it, whether they bequeath'd their Apostolical Authority to single Persons, or let it fall (like Gavel-kind Estates) to be equally divided among the whole Body of Presbyters, without any Superiority of one above another. For there we are wisely told, lies the Seat of the Controversy. *Whether the Apostles upon their with-drawing from the Government of Churches, did Substitute single Persons to succeed them; and if that could be made appear, all other things would speedily follow.*

But what if it cannot? It is, they say, then evident that they left it to the whole Body of the Presbyters without any Superior over them. But what is that Evidence? Do we find any Record that the Church was so govern'd after the Apostles? No, but it was so for some time: But who knows that time? It was that unknown interval of Time, next and immediately after the Apostles; Was it so?
then

then no man living knows any such time, and then there was none, for what is to us utterly unknown is to us utterly nothing. But how long did this unknown time continue? Why about 35 years, not 40. Then that was not time enough to give them Title by Prescription. But how do we know that it lasted so long and no longer? *Blondel* and *Salmasius* say so. What proof have they of it? They have Arguments for it *ex intimo Antiquitatis sinu*. But what are they? That is as unknown as the unknown time it self. Why then do they so positively affirm it? Because they are Prebyterians of the right Stamp, and therefore sworn and implacable Enemies to the true Primitive Christianity. But who alter'd this Form of Government, and where? If you ask who, that is as much in the Dark as the unknown time: If where, the Answer is ready, All the World over. What did all the World meet in one place? Then that's the place: If they did not, how could they agree all at once, to make this Universal Change? So that we are as much at a loss, *Where* all this World lyes, as *When* this unknown time was. But why did they abolish Presbyterian Parity, and set up Episcopal Superiority? to prevent Schisms. What then, could they not do it themselves?

selves? No, saith St. *Jerom*, by the working of the Devil among the Presbyters, they found it impossible. And so it is plain to common sense, that it was without the interposition of the Devil, if we only consider the Passions of Humane Nature, and if ever the Presbyters should fall out among themselves (a thing not to be avoided among Equals) every man might perpetuate the Quarrel for ever, by Ordaining as many Presbyters as he pleased to encrease his own Faction. From hence then it follows,

First, That it is impossible to govern the Christian Church without Bishops.

Secondly, That the Presbyterians themselves were the first Authors of Episcopacy because they found themselves unable to preserve peace in the Church without it.

Thirdly, That the Apostles made no sufficient provision for it, but left it exposed to numberless Schisms and Divisions, as many as there are Presbyters in the World.

Fourthly, That though the Government of the Church was left by our Saviour and his Apostles, to the Presbyters in common, yet it was never settled upon them by any Grant or Institution, and then beside that they have no Authority because no Commission, what need
of

of all this fury and clamour for the restitution of a form of Government, as if it stood upon Divine Right, when it is confessed, that it was meerly casual, and had no Authority either from our Saviour or his Apostles. And what if Episcopacy it self were not establisht by Divine Right, yet seeing no other Form was, to what purpose do men raise so many Tumults against it, as Antichristian, upon *Blondel's* own Principles? if there be no good in it, yet there is no harm; if we are not obliged to set it up, so neither are we to pull it down. And therefore why should he begin his Apology so Tragically, by comparing the Introduction of Episcopacy with the Primitive Antichrists, and the Hereticks that denyed our Saviour's very Incarnation, when if it was not a Divine Institution it self, it is yet confessed by the whole design of the Apology, that it did not thrust out any thing that was, and then at worst it is but an indifferent thing.

Fifthly, That the Presbyterian Government is so far from being grounded upon any Divine Institution, that it had its beginning meerly from Apostolical negligence and stupidity.

Sixthly, That it was quickly found so extremely absurd, that they that set it up
E
were

were themselves forc'd by woful Experience to lay it aside every where in less than Forty years Tryal. And now if they can satisfie themselves in this Apology *Pro sententiâ Hieronymi* (and it is all that either himself or *Blondel* makes) they are happy men, and long may they enjoy the pleasure of their opinion.

And yet after all these Surmises of an unknown Time, unknown Place, unknown Persons, they are all known to be notoriously false. In that it is most certainly known that there was no such devolution as St. *Jerom* dreams of, but that they appointed single Persons to succeed them in the Government of all the known Churches in the World. As for the Superiority of *Timothy* and *Titus* over the Presbyters in the Churches of *Ephesus* and *Creet*, upon St. *Paul's* leaving of those Eastern Parts of the World to plant new Churches in the West; it is so evident from the Scriptures themselves, that it is a shame to go about to prove it, but intolerable impudence to deny it. For as it is certain that the Apostle appointed these single Persons to preside over those Churches, so is it, that there were Presbyters already settled there, or to be settled by them. Now if the Churches were govern'd by a Common Council of meer Presbyters,

Presbyters, to what purpose was it to give a particular Commission to a single Person for its Government, if he were no more than every ordinary Presbyter. And therefore such a Commission to one over a Church, in which were already a number of Presbyters, is plainly to vest a peculiar Authority in him distinct from, and superiour to that of the Presbyters.

Thus for Example, when *St. Paul* left *Timothy* at *Ephesus*, where was already a number of Presbyters, as our Adversaries prove from the Apostle's Summoning them to *Miletus*, unless there were some Power in *Timothy* more than in a Presbyter, to what purpose should *St. Paul* beseech him so earnestly to abide in a Church, that was already furnished with such a number of Presbyters ? To what purpose should he give him, and him alone so many instructions for the right exercise of his Government, when himself was but an Atom of the whole Body ? To what purpose should he advise him in particular not to receive an Accusation against a Presbyter, unless attested by two or three Witnesses ? For if himself were no more than a single Presbyter, what had he to do to judge his fellow Presbyter ? Lastly, if the Power of the Church was in the Body of the Presbyters, why is all the Advice

for its due management given to a single Person ? and not to the Presbytery ? So evident is it that there were Presbyteries settled by the Apostles themselves in those very Churches over which they appointed single Governours. And so much do our zealous Adversaries gain in finding out so many Presbyteries in Scripture without a Bilhop, when it is so clear that the Apostles not only presided over them themselves, but that they appointed others to do so after them, which is apparently to vest the Supreme Government in a single Person above the Common-Council of Presbyters : But what can be more clearly attested than the uninterrupted Succession of Bishops in the greatest Churches from the Apostles themselves ? Do not all the Ancients by this undeniable Principle prescribe against Hereticks, and demonstrate the certain conveyance of the Orthodox Faith ? Hath not *Irenæus* for that very reason given us an exact Catalogue of the Bishops of *Rome*, down from the Apostles to his own time ; and doth not he immediately after tell us that *Polycarp*, with whom he was acquainted, was made Bishop of *Smyrna* by the Apostles ? And what was the Office of a Bishop, as distinct from that of a Presbyter, himself very well knew, who was first a Presbyter, and then

lib. 3. cap. 3.

a Bishop. Doth not *Tertullian* make the same Challenge for several Apostolical Churches, and he too very well knew the difference, being himself a Presbyter, but never a Bishop? Hath not *Hegesippus* given us an account of several Successions; Who, as he was a very Ancient Writer, so he liv'd after the time in which the distinction of the Names of Bishop and Presbyter was made. The Succession at *Jerusalem* I have already prov'd. As for that of *Antioch* from *St. Peter*, beside the unanimous Testimony of the Ancients I hope I need not prove that *Ignatius* was no Presbyterian. The Succession of the Church of *Alexandria* from *St. Mark* is so clear that I do not know that it was ever question'd, and it is particularly asserted by *St. Jerom* himself. And lastly, *Dionysius* Bishop of *Corinth*, a learned and an early Writer of the same Age with *Hegesippus*, hath described the Succession at *Athens* from *Dionysius* the *Aropagite*. Now I would fain know what better Testimony men would have for a matter of Fact. The Witnesses are of unspotted Credit, they give their Evidence in the face of their Enemies. They appeal to the undoubted Records of the Churches themselves, they lived near enough to the time of the Apostles, to be sufficient Witnesses of their own know-

De prescrip.
c. 32. &
36.

Euseb. l. 4.
cap. 22.

Euseb. l. 4.
cap. 23.

ledge, and that which is most considerable of all is, that they liv'd after the distinction between the Names of Bishop and Presbyter, and as often as they have Occasion to mention them, speak of them as distinct Offices, and therefore by their Succession of Bishops from the Apostles, they could mean nothing but true and proper Bishops.

§. V. And it is very observable that the Community of the Names Bishop and Presbyter was proper to the Apostolical times, while the Apostles themselves kept the greatest part of the Episcopal Authority in their own hands: but as soon as they were withdrawn, and so the Name of an Apostle began to be laid aside, the Name of Bishop was appropriated to their Successors in their Supremacy. So that we find not one Writer after the Apostles time (unless possibly *St. Clement* and *St. Polycarp* may be doubted, of which afterward) that doth not very carefully distinguish the Names of Bishop and Presbyter, the one as peculiarly appertaining to the Supreme Order, the other as to the Inferiour, so as never to give the Name of Bishop to a Presbyter, or of a Presbyter to a Bishop. And that's a clear demonstration, that as there was an imparity in
Eccle-

Ecclesiastical Officers during the Apostles time, so there was ever alter, and that when their next Successors could not be properly itiled Apostles, the word Bishop was appropriated to them, to express their Order as distinct from, and superiour to the Presbyters. I know indeed that *Blondel*, *Salmasius*, and *Daille* that *Geneva* Triumvirate or Confederacy for the Subversion of the Ancient State of the Christian Church, have after their usual manner rak'd together vast heaps of Instances out of the Writers of the two first Ages, in which the Name *Presbyter* is applied to Bishops, but they all depend upon one small Quibble, or Equivocal Sence of the word, as it sometime signifies *Age*, and sometime *Office* : For there is not one instance in which they give the Title of a Presbyter to a Bishop of their own time, and whenever they speak of them, appropriate it to subordinate Presbyters, to express their distinction from Bishops ; but when they speak of Bishops of former times, they give them sometime the Appellation of *Presbyters*, as it is equivalent with that of *Ancients*, and signifies not their Office, but their Antiquity in the Church, and so might be given not only to all Orders of the Clergy, but to the Laity, and the whole Body of Christians,

by whom the Apostolical Tradition was any way conveyed down to After-ages. And it was upon that Occasion that they used this word, to shew the certainty of the Conveyance of the true Christian Doctrine from the Apostles, in that they received it from the *Ancients* that received it from them ; in this Sence, and in this onely do they use the Word, as it denotes not their Office but their Age. This one short observation is a clear Answer to all their voluminous heaps of Collections, that though they make a great shew to the ignorant with the length of their Train, yet they all run upon this poor and dull mistake, as will appear more fully when we come to the particulars. In the mean time it is enough to our present purpose, that the Episcopal Succession to the Apostles is so unanswerably prov'd, and attested by the most Ancient Writers of the Church, and that without Ambiguity or Equivocation in their words.

And indeed this is so plain, not only as to the Name but the Thing, that our fiercest Adversaries cannot but often confess

P. 7.

*Rem esse Antiquissimam ut duo
hi ordines in Ecclesiâ fuerint di-
stincti, Episcoporum & Presbyte-
rorum, si excipiantur Apostolica
tempora.*

it, even the mighty *Walo* himself states the Question thus, That there was a real distinction between Bishops and Presbyters in
the

the most ancient Ages of the Church, excepting only the very time of the Apostles. And if so, then was it in all Ages of the Church, when it is undeniable that the Apostles challeng'd a Superiority themselves during their own time, and *Walo* confesses that the Bishops exercised the same in all Ages after them. And that certainly is enough (if any proof can be so) against the Presbyterian Parity.

And yet I would not make any Advantage of this Confession, for that were only to convince one man, who is long since past it, and to say truth was never capable of it, but for the undeniable Proof of the matter of Fact it self; in that the most inquisitive Searchers in this Argument are forc'd to confess, that there is no instance in all Antiquity of any settled Church, without a Superiour and Subordinate Clergy, beside Deacons, and if that be evident, it is no matter what they plead beside, but especially as to St. *Jerom's* unknown time, for beside that there was no such time; that any man knows of, so is it a flat Contradiction to what all men know, and our Adversaries confess, that in all Ages of the Church there was a Superiority of some above others, *i. e.* of the Apostles, in their time, and of the Bishops in all times

times except the Apostles, and if so, then always.

*In Cal.
Scriptorum.*

And in this *St. Jerom* himself is as unhappy as any of his pretended followers, for when he hath, in haste, refer'd the Original of Episcopal Superiority to an unknown Interval, sometime after the Apostles, yet he derives the Custom at *Alexandria*, where the Presbyters make their own Bishop, (but yet a proper Bishop) from the death of *St. Mark*, who yet according to his own account, dyed before almost all the Apostles, and near forty years before *St. John*, suffering in the Eighth year of *Nero*. Now though these are the two greatest passages alledged against Episcopacy, they are very reconcileable with each other. And in his very Epistle to *Evagrius*, he expressly calls the three Orders of the Clergy Bishop, Priest, and Deacon an Apostolical Tradition, as settled by the Apostles themselves, particularly at *Rome*, *Jerusalem*, and *Antioch*. And yet notwithstanding that *St. Jerom* hath thus clearly demonstrated the fallhood and vanity of his own surmise of an unknown Interval, by shewing that there could be no such time from the known Records of the Church, that attest the Succession of single Bishops from the Apostles themselves, yet for all that his pretended

pretended followers will keep to their dark and blind Age next after the Apostles, and though themselves agree that it lasted not above 40 years at most, about or before which time began the Institution of Episcopal Superiority in all Christian Churches, yet are they so preposterous in their Zeal, as to go about to prove the Presbyterian Parity, for divers following Ages, from the Testimony of the Writers that lived in them ; which, beside that it is notoriously false, it is a gross affront both to St. *Jerom* and themselves, when they have limited the Presbyterian Parity to the first Age after the Apostles, after that to derive it down thorough all following Ages. And yet this they have labour'd with vast pains, and with downright violence haled in all the Fathers to the Patronage of their Cause, expressly against their own Sence. The Instances of this in *Blondel*, *Walo*, and *Daille* are all along so scandalous that I once thought it a shame to encounter them, and for that reason pass'd them over in treating of this Argument, but because I find them urg'd with so much Confidence by our restless *Smeectymnuans* at home, only to abuse their ignorant followers (who poor Creatures are no doubt very competent Judges of their Truth or Falshood) I shall let them

see

see the integrity of their Leaders, in seducing them not onely into an open Schism, but an irreconcilable Apostacy from the State of the whole Christian Church in all Ages, with the most perverse and palpable falsehoods. And I find they will never suffer us to enjoy Quiet and Peace at home, till we have rifled the *Blondellian*, *Wallonian* and *Dailleán* Magazines, out of whom they upon all Occasions of Disturbance, furnish themselves with all their Pretence and Shew of Learning against the Church; and that is all that they do in defence of their Cause, to transcribe Citations out of them, but chiefly *Blondel*, who indeed is the Father of them all, for *Walo* is such a confused, wandering and immethodical Writer, that few regard him, though, as to substance, his Writings are the same with *Blondel's*; and *Daille* does little more than follow them both, unless that now and then he forrage to fetch in a new Quotation; and therefore I shall keep close to *Blondel*, to whom if we refer the several concurrent Passages of the other two, it will appear that all the Books against Episcopacy are but one, and that is *Blondel's*, and how wise an one that is, let the World farther judge from the ensuing Animadversions.

§. V I. And first as for St. *Clement* of *Rome*, his Case is the same with that of the Apostles, and the same Account that hath been given of the Sence of their Writings in this Controversie, is to be given of his; for being an Apostolical man, and conversant with the Apostles, no wonder if he expresses himself in their Language, and therefore he sometimes describes the whole Body of the Clergy by two Orders, one Ministerial, the other Sacerdotal, as it was in the Jewish Hierarchy; but whether there were an equality of all in the Sacerdotal Order, or whether a Superiority of some above others, cannot be collected from the signification of the word it self, because it signifies any kind or degree of Authority; and therefore how many degrees soever there might be of Ruling Clergy, it equally comprehends them all within its signification, though himself reckons up two Orders as superior to Deacons, and that is enough. And yet out of this small Epistle what heaps of Inferences hath *Blondel* rak'd for his P. 9.
 Presbyterian Parity? And first he argues *Daille* P.
 very shrewdly from its Inscription, *The* 394.
Church of Rome to the Church of Corinth.
 From whence it follows that seeing there is no mention of the Clergy of either
 Church

Church as distinct from the People, that they were govern'd by a Common Council of Rulers. But if any thing could follow from hence, it is that there were no Clergy at all, but that the Church was govern'd meerly by the People without any other Rulers, so that it takes away his *Common-Council*, as well as our single Bishop. But what would these men conclude that *St. Clement* was not Author of this Epistle? Of that we have the same certainty as of the Epistle it self. Or that because he drew it up in the name of his Church he was not their Bishop? If there were any Logick in the inference, as there is none, yet it will not do against Evidence of Fact, in that we have as much certainty that *Clement* was Bishop of *Rome*, as that there was then a Church of *Rome*. All the most Ancient Writers of the Church, *Ignatius*, *Hegeffippus*, *Irenæus*, styling him particular Bishop of that place; Writers that distinguish'd a Bishop from a Presbyter, and never use the word, but of one as superior to Presbyters. Particularly *Irenæus* affirms in exprefs words, That *Clement* was Bishop of *Rome* when he wrote this Epistle, and that he succeeded to the Apostles in his Bishoprick; and therefore he was a proper Bishop, as superiour to Priests and Deacons, for that was the

lib. 3. cap. 3.

the only use of the word in *Irenæus's* time, who himself was first Presbyter, and then Bishop of the Church of *Lyons*; and therefore when he avers that *St. Clement* was appointed Bishop of *Rome* by the Apostles, he is to be understood in his own Sense, as superiour to Presbyters, such as himself was when advanc'd from the Presbytery into the Episcopal Throne. So clear an instance is this Epistle of the Succession of Bishops to the Apostolical Supremacy. But why did he write not in his own but his Churches Name? Though the Question be very impertinent, to demand the reason of another man's actions at so great a distance of time, yet there is an easie and an obvious Account to be given of it, *vizi* That addressing this Exhortation to the factious Party of the People against the Clergy, he might not think it so proper at first to make use of his own Episcopal Authority, but rather with all gentleness and Brotherly love to perswade them in the name of the whole Church to reconcile themselves to their Pastors. For this coming from the People, it would more effectually move, and in a manner upbraid them to compliance and humility. And so it prov'd, for so *Hegeſippus* informs Euseb. l. 4. c. 22, us, That from that time forward the Church of *Corinth* continued in the right Faith,

Faith, till the time of *Primus* their Bishop, with whom in his Voyage to *Rome* he conversed many days at *Corinth*, and so from him understood the true state of that Church.

But the demonstrative Passage in this Epistle is this, *That the Apostles Preaching the Word thorow divers Country's and Cities, Ordained every where the first fruits of such as believ'd, having made Proof and Tryal of them by the Spirit, to be Overseers and Deacons to minister to them that should afterwards believe. And this (says he) they did, because they understood from our Lord, that Strife and Contention would arise about Episcopacy, and therefore having absolute knowledg beforehand thereof, they appointed the Persons before-mention'd into that Office, with this instruction, That as some dyed, others well approv'd should be chosen into their Ministry. Very well! for if the Apostles foreseeing that there would arise Schisms and Dissentions in the Church about the Government or Episcopacy of it, took particular Care to settle Governors over the Churches of their own Conversion for the prevention of that Mischief, and withal vested any of them with the same Power that themselves had exercised, to appoint their Successors, as the Apostles had appointed them, to all future*
Ages

Ages of the Church. In the first place, what could be more peremptorily express'd to contradict *St. Jerom's* Dream, That the Government of the Church naturally fell into the Presbyters hands, because the Apostles had taken no Care for its Settlement after their own time? Whereas it is here positively averr'd by this Apostolical Man, that they were so far from being guilty of such a stupid negligence, that they took particular Care to settle its Government for all After-Ages, as foreseeing how impossible it would be to prevent everlasting Schisms and Factions about it, if it had bin left undetermin'd and expos'd to every one that would challenge it. And the truth is, if they should not have had so much insight into the nature of things, as to foresee that there would have bin no End of Contention about Government, whilst it was left in common, all the World would have condemn'd them of unpardonable Stupidity; So that the Wisdom of the Church which *St. Jerome* imputes to the experience of those that follow'd, is by this Apostolical Man plainly ascrib'd to the foresight of the Apostles, and those that went before; So clear a Barr is this Epistle to the Claim of *Presbyterian* Devolution, and so is it to the Peoples Right of electing
F their

their Officers, as the *Independents* plead, when it is evident that the Apostles left it not to their choice, but set such Officers over them as themself's liked and approv'd of.

Secondly, if the Apostles receiv'd their Power from Christ, as Christ did his from God, (for so St. *Clement* affirms) and in pursuance of his Divine Institution appointed Officers in the Church with this Instruction, That they should appoint others to succeed them in their Office, and so downward thro all Ages of the Church, What can be more evident, than that they left the same Supreme Authority, wherewith they were endued, appointing Rulers in the Church to succeed themself's, as they succeeded our Savior?

P. 11.

For as *Blondel* observes, the form of Ecclesiastical Government was never altered by the Apostles; So that if they themself's were vested with a Supremacy of Power in the Church, they conveyed the same Power to their Successors, because the Power of Government wherewith they were immediately endued by our Savior, was to continue for ever.

But *Blondel* never thinks he hath Inference enough, and therefore after he hath drawn Presbytery out of this Epistle, he proceeds in the next place to bring forth

Inde-

Independency. *Viz.* That the Officers of the Church when ever there was any Competition, were appointed by the People. That is becaus they were appointed by the Apostles themself's, for so St. *Clement* tells us they were; to prevent the Contentions that might arise about their Election, if they had not settled it by their own Authority. So that the Inference is this, That *Clement* affirms that the Apostles left not the Choice of Officers to the People, therefore sayes *Blondel* they left it to the Choice of the People. And that is a very fair Inference; but the most pleasant of all is, that the Presbyters took Place according to Seniority, and so the Eldest Presbyter presided in all Debates and Councils, because the Apostles appointed the *first fruits* of their Conversion to be Officers in the Church; as if every one that was first Converted had a Right to it, or as if all their first fruits had bin made Church-Officers, when St. *Clement* tells us that they chose such out of them, as they judged fittest for the Work. And therefore *Blondel* himself cautiously adds in a Parenthesis, *Si modo probabiles essent*, and that eats up the Assertion; for by that they were chose not for their Seniority, but their other Qualifications. But tho there is no footstep of any Presbyterian

byterian Seniority in all the Records of the Church, Yet *Blondel* is resolv'd to have it so, becaus without it he cannot avoid that Superiority that is given to Single Persons over Presbyteries in all Churches; And therefore there is not any one Passage that he hath alledg'd out of the Fathers to which he hath not tack'd this Conclusion, tho it sounds no more towards it, than that in the Beginning God Created the Heaven and Earth.

And yet this Story of Succession by meer Seniority, as ungrounded as it is, is the third Fundamental Article of the *Presbyterian* Cause; for next to St. *Jerom's* unknown Interval, and the Equivalency of the words *Bishop* and *Presbyter* in the Apostolical Age, this Fable of succeeding in Presidency over the Colledg of Presbyters only by right of Seniority, is most clamorously insisted upon by the *French* Brethren. *Walo* is very fierce and vehement in its Pursuit; but *Blondel* lays it for the very Foundation of his whole discourse, and declares at the beginning of his Undertaking, That without its Supposition there is no understanding the State or Records of the Primitive Church; but that being once granted, it clears all difficulties that occur in Church History. And therefore he does not only lay down this

Hypo-

P. 206,

273.

Prefat.

P. 7.

Hypothesis fundamenti loco (as he expresses it) as a Foundation of his whole work, but he withal lays his Foundation *inconcussis firmamentis*, upon everlasting Pillars. And therefore partly because of his great confidence, but chiefly because 'tis his main shift to elude the Argument of Succession by single Persons; it having here fallen in my way, I shall once for all consider it, that I may avoid the tedious impertinency that he has fallen into, of repeating it afresh upon every Citation.

And in the first place this being the great Foundation, and standing upon the Pillars of the Earth, one would expect that the Man has at least some plausible grounds to support both that and the weight of his own confidence; yet when he comes to talk of nothing but Sun-shine and demonstration, his whole discourse is all dream and fiction, without so much as any shadow of Authority. So that he does not so much as attempt to bring one Precedent to warrant his Assertion, nothing but wild and remote fetches that stand upon no Pillars but meer guess and empty Air. Though that which farther aggravates his confidence, is, That the Learned Jesuite *Petavius* had, to rebuke *Walo's* pertness, made a publick Challenge

to all the World, to assign but any one instance of it in all the Records of the Christian Church, and yet *Blondel* should undertake to refute some passages in the very same Page, without concerning himself in the least to take notice of so bold a Challenge, but much less to answer it. Though that which worst of all enhances his disingenuity is, that he is so far from producing any tolerable Precedent for his Conceit, that he begins his whole discourse with two particular instances that overthrow it, *viz. Timothy and Titus*, in whom he confesses the Rule was not observed, and that is a very good beginning to lay an immoveable Foundation to prove it was. But he supplies his want of History with strength of Argument, and in his tedious Notes upon the counterfeit *Ambrose*, has fortified it on all sides with Arguments fetcht from the very Bowels of Antiquity [*Ex intimo remotissimæ Antiquitatis sinu repetitis*] But he has drawn them forth with that force and violence, that he has rather unbowell'd then deliver'd Antiquity of its burthen. He begins with the forementioned standing passage out of *St. Clement*, that the Apostles Ordain'd out of their First-fruits Governours of the Church. And so no doubt they did, because they had none other

P. 58. N.
to, &c.

ther to Ordain; but who could ever have believed that any man could hence conclude that they always pitch't upon the Eldest Christian in every Church, because they chose out of their first Converts those that they judged fittest for the trust. But *Blondel* adds, That our Saviour chose his first Disciples to be his Apostles, and that *St. Peter* made a Qualification of an Apostle to be Elected into the place of *Judas*, that he had conversed with our Saviour from the beginning. And very good reason too, when the first point of his Office then was to be a witness of his Works and Miracles; And every Child has sense enough to understand that *St. Peter* had regard to that alone in his Qualification, and not meerly to any mans age that was uncapable in it self of being any reason at all. But in the next place, *St. Paul*, and after him several Councils forbid *Neophytes* or raw Converts to be made Bishops. From whence no doubt it follows of its own Accord, that therefore the most ancient Convert had right to it by vertue of his Seniority. These are the wonderful Arguments rak't from the very Bowels of Antiquity to demonstrate the fix't and perpetual Observation of this Rule. Though who could think it possible that any man of Learning or but

natural Sense could be so bewitch't with his own folly, as to think of imposing upon the World with such intolerable trash and trifling.

Secondly, the time that he assigns for the continuance of this Custom, *viz.* to the 36 year of the Second Century, is altogether precarious, and without any other ground than that it suits with his own time of St. *Jerom's* Alteration of Government all the World over; for that he places in the very same Interval, and upon as good Authority, that is none at all but his own. Neither is he here content with asserting this change in general, but fixes the same time in divers particular Churches. As in the Church of *Jerusalem* he begins the Custom of Elections at *Mark* the 16th Bishop of that See, and the first Gentile that sat in it, in the Year 135. after the rebuilding of the City by *Adrian*, and when it was Inhabited only by the *Gentiles*. This he insists upon with mighty zeal and importunity, but does not so much as attempt to prove it by any one Record, only one small argument he is very much transported with, *viz.* the short time of their sitting, which (as he fancy's) could come to pass from no other reason than their great Age, when they came to succeed. But as it happens very
unluckily,

unluckily, the Succession of Bishops after *Mark* is altogether as quick upon one another as it was before. And yet the times were then much more secure and peaceable, whereas before *Jerusalem* had been for many years a publique Slaughter-house to the *Romans*; the *Jews* upon every little Opportunity breaking out into Rebellion, and by their perpetual disorders so highly provoked their *Roman* Masters, that they made havock of all that came in their way, without making any distinction between *Jew* and Christian; all Christians at that time passing under the name of *Jews*. No wonder then if in such a time of Warr and Bloodshed (the most destructive that ever was from the Creation) any that were members of the Jewish Commonwealth met with such speedy and untimely Deaths. And whereas *Blondel* observes, that during all that time there was no Persecution at *Jerusalem* as there was at *Rome*, from whence it came to pass that some of the *Roman* Bishops sat not many Months; he might withal have consider'd, That Warr, but especially Rebellion, are as destructive as Persecution; but most of all such a War as this was against the *Jews*, that was carried on with all the keenness of Outrage and Inhumanity, Whilst they slaughter'd them, not
as

as they conquer'd other Nations, but out of implacable hatred to the Nation it self, partly from their frequent Rebellions, and partly from their Opposition to the Establish't Religion of the Empire.

His next instance of this Custom is in the Church of *Alexandria*, and this he proves out of *Eutychius* ; but if his Testimony were of any Validity, as it is of none at all, it is expressly cross to his own design ; for he affirms in peremptory terms, That the Patriarchs of *Alexandria* always succeeded by Election, [*ut cum vacaret Patriarchatus, eligerent unum è duodecim Presbyteris.*] And yet this is the only Passage that *Blondel* produces for Succession by meer Seniority. His other proofs of this Custom in the Churches of *Antioch*, *Athens* and *Rome*, are nothing but frivolous Surmises, in that most of them are said to have been acquainted with the Apostles, from whence he concludes, that they therefore succeeded by right of Seniority. But such trifles are too contemptible to be answer'd, and it is in vain to argue with men that can fatisfie themselves with such shadows of proof ; for there is no cause in the World so absurd, but is capable of as wise Apologies as these : So that in the result of all, Presbytery is not more exposed by any one

one thing than the meanness of its own Pleas ; for if it had any thing tolerable to say in its own behalf, it would certainly scorn to condescend to such hungry and begging ways of Argumentation.

Thirdly, when he makes this unknown change of Custom to have been decreed & instituted by solemn Council, it will be as hard to find any such Council, as it is that œcumenical one of St. *Jerom*, in which *toto Orbe decretum est*, it was agreed all the World over to settle the Church in a wiser posture of Government than the Apostles had done. A Council that was never heard of by any man but himself, nor by himself till he had heard himself say so. And it was no doubt the very same Council (for they sat at the same time) that made *Blondel's* universal change of Succession ; and we find just as much evidence of it in the ancient Records. But *Blondel*, because he will say something, it matters not how awkerdly it serves his turn, lays this great alteration on the great *Nicene* Council, Canon the Fourth. But alas this time came much too late for the time of this universal Alteration, it met not till the Year 325, whereas the change, according to *Blondel*, was made in the Year 135, long before any of the *Nicene* Fathers or their great Grandfathers were born

born into the World. But then secondly, there is no such thing expressed or any way intimated in the Canon it self, whereby it is decreed, That every Bishop shall be elected by the Vote of all the Bishops of the Province, or their consent by Letter, and the Election to be confirm'd and approv'd of by the Metropolitan, and the Ordination to be solemnised by three Bishops at least. What appearance here of any change from Succession by Age to that of Election? Here is not a syllable of abrogating the former, nothing but a ratification of the Old Custom and Form both of Election and Consecration. For *St. Clement* tells us, That the first Bishops were chosen and appointed by the Apostles themselves; And *St. Cyprian* assures us that the same Custom was observed in his time in his own and almost all other Provinces, and that too *de Traditione divina & Apostolica observatione*. So that this Canon was no new Institution, but only a Confirmation of the old Apostolical Tradition. For whereas the same method of Election and Ordination had been always and in all Churches observed, it was of late openly violated by *Meletius*, whose Irregular proceedings gave occasion to the Enacting not only this but the two following Canons. For he had taken
upon

Ep. 68.

upon him where ever he came to appoint and ordain Bishops, Priests and Deacons, by his own single Authority ; of which Complaint being brought to the Council, they made this Canon, to stop so wild an Enormity. And now what does all this signifie towards proving the change of Succession by Age to that of Election?

Fourthly, the reason that he assigns of this Alteration, is a very foul reflection upon the Wisdom of the Apostles and Apostolical Church, *Iniquum secundi seculi fideles censebant*, &c. P. 8. 'The Believers of the 'Second Age thought it unjust, that they 'who had less gifts should have greater 'honour and be preferr'd before the more 'worthy, but that men ought to be preferr'd according to their merits and abilities, lest God should be defrauded of 'the use of those Talents that he had bestowed upon them for the Service of his 'Church. This is so very good a reason, that it could be nothing but dulness and stupidity in the Apostles and Christians of the First Century not to observe it. But instead thereof to have no regard to useful qualifications for the disposal of the highest Authority in the Church, and annex it meerly to old age howsoever unfit and unable to manage it, is such a grossness of folly as cannot be equall'd. And

Blondel

P. 17. *Blondel* himself has pretty well set it off in his foremention'd Account of the quick Successions of Bishops at *Jerusalem*, *Quis tam crasso sub Aëre natos, &c.* ' Who can
 ' believe that the Sons of *Sion* breathed
 ' such dull Air, and were so stupidly neg-
 ' ligent of the common Edification of the
 ' Church, that passing by the more able
 ' and vigorous, they should make choice
 ' of dotards half dead, [*animam mox acturos,*
 ' *capulares senes & filicernia*] men altoge-
 ' ther incapable to discharge the Office
 ' of the Episcopal Chair. But we shall
 ' admit no absurdity, and proceed upon
 ' just and good grounds, if (the Custom
 ' of preferring by Seniority being in force)
 ' the ancient Church of *Jerusalem* gave
 ' every one their due, and therefore would
 ' not deny the right of Seniority to any
 ' of the ancient Presbyters for their very
 ' old age. For in what condition soever
 ' the second was, when the first departed
 ' this life, if he were but *compos mentis*, he
 ' was not to be defrauded one moment of
 ' the Prerogative due to his Age, but was
 ' to be placed in his turn in the Chair of
 ' Presidency. Now has not *Blondel* here
 made a very fair Apology for the Wisdom
 of the Apostles, to lay the Institution or
 at least the Prescription of so absurd and
 sottish a Custom at their Doors; and ex-
 cuse

cuse the Christians that followed after them from the worst of folly, only because they were forced to comply with a Custom, that the Apostles had by their practice made a right in the Christian Church? So unhappy are these men in their Apologies, as still to leave the Wisdom of the Apostles in the Church. The *Sententia Hieronymi* supposes them so weak in their Understandings as to have left the Church in such a posture, in which it must have been fatally destroyed by Schisms; which gross defect was afterward made up by Men that were wiser than themselves, and were made so by the Experience of their folly. And this defence here supposes them so void of common sense, as to appoint for the Supreme Government of the Church such Persons as in the ordinary course of Nature, were of all men unfittest to undertake it, and least able to manage it.

But lastly, granting all that *Blondel* contends for, I cannot understand what he gains by it; for it gives his President by Seniority all that Power that we make proper to a Bishop by Election, viz. That nothing be done without him, or as *Blondel* himself expresses it, *Ut omnem Ecclesiæ actum præ non sine aliis gubernaret.* In short, that which the Greek Canons call the

Pref. p. 63

the τὸ κῦρ & τῶν γινόμενων, that Authority that was necessary to give validity to every action, and after that it is not at all material to this dispute to enquire after the manner of Succession; for whether they received it by Seniority or by Election, yet so long as it was a Superior Power, and derived to them from the Apostles, that is all that we do or can demand for Episcopal Superiority. *Blondel* indeed would intimate as if they succeeded without any shadow of Precedent or Record then only of *Eutychius*, who says that it was so done at *Alexandria*; but he writes at random, and if he did not, is not of age enough to speak for himself in a matter of so great Antiquity. *St. Jerom* and the Counterfeit *Ambrose* say that the Bishop was always taken out of the Colledge of Presbyters, but they nowhere affirm that he entred upon his Office without any farther Consecration. And yet because they express themselves only in general terms, and do not make particular mention of his Ordination, our Adversaries conclude that he had none. So hardly do they deal with the Ancients when they would draw them to them to their side, as to conclude, that whatever they do not affirm, they deny. But once for all, if they had in express terms averr'd,

That from the time of the Apostles the Senior Presbyter succeeded a Bishop without any new Ordination, their Testimony would have been of as little Authority as the Tale of *Eutychius*. For they lived at too great a distance from the Apostolical Age, to know any thing of it but from more ancient Records, and therefore their own bare Testimony is here of as little weight as *Blondel's* or *Walo's* own affirmation upon their own Authority. For a man that lives three or four hundred years after a matter of fact, is as incompetent a witness of it, as he that lives fourteen, unless he can vouch it by some more ancient Testimony ; and then it is believed not upon his own but his Author's Authority. And therefore neither *St. Jerom* nor the Counterfeit *Ambrose*, nor any other that lived in the Fourth Century, ought to be regarded or trusted for any thing they say concerning things done in the First, when they bring nothing to prove it but their own Assertion. So that if *Blondel* had their Testimony, it would do him no service ; but when he has it not, he talks altogether without book and without authority. All these Considerations I hope are enough to shew the vanity of *Blondel's* Dream of Succession by Seniority ; and so I return

to St. *Clement*, from whom *Blondel* has drawn me into this Digression.

And here the only advantageous Circumstance that our Innovators can have from this Epistle, is, that there was no Bishop at that time at *Corinth*; as from the Nature of the Schisme 'tis probable there was not; for that seems to have bin the bottom of it, it being made by some of the People against the Presbyters, who not having the Supreme Authority in the Church, had not sufficient Power to suppress their Insolence. And it seems to be the very same Case that hapned in St. *Paul's* time, when as the Counterfeit *Ambrose* (the *Presbyterians* Darling Author) affirms that Schisms were so easily made in the Church, by the Presbyters or the People, *Quia adhuc Rectores Ecclesiis non omnibus locis fuerant constituti*; *Becaus the Governors of Churches were not as yet settled in all places.* The Apostles and Evangelists not thinking fit to appoint them, till they had brought the Work to some perfection. And therefore (as I have already observ'd) we find but few settled Bishops in their own time, that Office chiefly resting in themself's, unless in the Church of *Jerusalem*. Which being the Mother Church of all, must needs be brought to its due Settlement before any of its Colonies and
 Planta-

Plantations.. And whether as yet there had been any particular Bishop set over the Church of *Corinth* is not to be known from History: And whether there had been any, and the See were now vacant, or as yet there had been none, the state of that Church was no other then it was under *St. Paul* ; subject to some Evangelist or Apostolical man, who took the same Episcopal oversight of it, as the Apostle himself did. As *Dionysius* at *Athens*, *Titus* in *Crete*; *Timothy* at *Ephesus* ; and as we find by this Epistle *Clement* at *Rome*; who tell the Schismatics that those very Priests, that they had presum'd to depose from their Ministry, were placed over them either by the Apostles themselves, or by some other eminent Persons, such as were the Evangelists or Secondary Apostles ; so that it is evident enough, that they were still under the Care of some Apostolical men. Now because perhaps there was not a settled Bishop at that time at *Corinth*, from thence to infer that there was then no such Order of men in the World; and that though we know the very Names of several Bishops in several Churches; shews how bold men are forc'd to be with their own understandings when they will be se'd or brib'd into the defence of a bad Cause: In short, when it is evident that

the Apostles exercised a Supremacy over their own Churches; when they vested divers single Persons with the same Power, as *Titus* not onely over all the Churches, but all the Presbyters and Deacons in the severall Towns and Cites in *Creet*; when in the most eminent Churches a personal Succession of Bishops from the very Apostles is Recorded; when this Epistle is written by one who is a proper Bishop, and succeeded to an Apostle in his Bishoprick; when in his Description of the Hierarchy in the Christian Church, he specifies three, in allusion to the three Orders of High-Priest, Priest, and Levite in the Jewish, a thing very usual with the first Writers of the Church, even *St. Jerom* himself, and that in his Epistle to *Evagrius*, *Et ut Sciamus Traditiones Apostolicas sumptas de veteri Testamento, quod Aaron & filii ejus & Levitæ in Templo fuerunt, hoc sibi Episcopi & Presbyteri & Diaconi vendicent in Ecclesiâ.* What the High-Priest, Priests, and Levites were in the Temple, that the Bishops, Presbyters and Deacons ought by Apostolical Constitution, following the Jewish Polity, to be in the Church. Now when after all this we do not find that there was a settled Bishop at *Corinth* at the time of this Schism, if men will conclude that there were

were then no Bishops in the Christian World, they may do so for their own pleasure, but then I would humbly move, that they would be pleased not to impose their Conclusion upon other mens understandings.

§. VII. The next in order is *Ignatius*, but our foreign Brethren pass him by as an irreclaimable Prelate, though at home of late one makes him a rigid Presbyterian, another a nice Independent, a third nothing ; with such modesty and integrity do some men deal with their Authors : For who could think it, that when St. *Ignatius* doth every where so expressly distinguish the three Orders of the Clergy, any man could be so confident as to force him to vouch his Opinion, that allows only two : For that's the first point of the Episcopal Controversie. But the most pleasant observation that they scratch out of him is, that the extent of Churches then reach'd not beyond *Personal Communion* ; so that every Church was no more then a single Parish or Congregation, in which all the members of the Church might Assemble together ; that is to say, they would have every particular Parish or Congregation in *England* provided with a Bishop, one Company of Presbyters, and

another of Deacons, for that's the Church state that *Ignatius* describes in all the Churches that he writes to; and therefore having so many Officers in them, it is evident that their Communion extended beyond a single Congregation: For it would have been a very superfluous thing to provide such a multitude of Officers for so small a company of Men. So grossly do these careless Writers, that contend not for truth but faction, impose both upon their Authors, and their followers, and themselves. But men that have a Rabble to abuse may and will say any thing.

As for the Authority of the Epistles themselves I have nothing more to say, having prov'd that they are so clear from any suspicion of being supposititious that it is no way possible they should be so. And that there is not any one Writing of all the Ancients that hath been preserv'd and deliver'd down to us, by a more certain and uninterrupted Tradition than these Epistles. And if so, they are an unanswerable Demonstration of the Divine Right and Apostolical Practice of Episcopal Superiority. Onely there remains one weighty Argument of Monsieur *Daille's*, that he calls his *Argumentum Palmarium*, which I have not as yet consider'd, and

and that is the constant distinct use of the names Bishop and Presbyter in these Epistles, which, says he, was never observed by the Apostles, nor any Writers for the first two hundred years. As for the Writers after the Apostles, we shall shew that they did as Religiously as *Ignatius* himself observe the Distinction of the Names, and then if there be any Crime in that, they are all as guilty as *Ignatius*. As for the Apostolical Age, it is confessed, that whilst the Apostolical Order continued, the distinct signification of these words was not settled, but was afterward introduc'd to avoid the confusion of Offices. Now I pray what absurdity is there in this ; O yes, saith *Daillè*, it is intolerable, and an affront to the Apostles themselves, such a rudeness as is not to be supposed in any Apostolical man, and therefore sums up his tedious Argument in this Tragical Declamation. *Nunc ergo à vobis Latini, à te Hammonde quæro cur hanc Apostolici Sermonis Lucæ, Pauli, Petri, Johannis & Jacobi, imo Sancti Spiritus per eos scribentis usu consignatam ac Consecratam consuetudinem carissimus atque excellentissimus eorum (ut vos vultis) Discipulus, Successor, ac Filius Ignatius ita plane penitusq; aversatus sit, &c.* “ And therefore now I demand of you Latines, (and so he styles

"all Churches that are not of the Geneva
 "cut) and particularly of you *Hammond*,
 "why this dear, this excellent (as you sup-
 "pose) Disciple, Successor, Son of the
 "Apostles should dare so avowedly to re-
 "ject a form of Apostolical Speech, a
 "Speech sign'd and consecrated by *Luke*,
 "*Paul, Peter, John* and *James*; yes and the
 "Holy Ghost himself writing by them.
 This sorrowful Exclamation breaks out
 in every Page, and is the very Spirit and
 Life of the Argument. And I must con-
 fess it is a very Tragical thing to slight
 Apostolical Institutions, because they are
 really and indeed *Consecrated*, for the per-
 petual use of the Church, but as for Apo-
 stolical words I never heard that they
Consecrated any, and then 'tis no such enor-
 mous contempt of their Authority, if in
 the signification of Words we follow the
 Custom of the time rather than theirs.
 For the Apostles never took upon them
 the Authority of Grammarians; their bu-
 siness was to settle Churches, not Schools;
 and if men would but follow them in the
 institution of things, they would freely al-
 low them their own liberty in the use of
 words. And therefore our learned man
 is too Tragical in loading *Ignatius* his de-
 parting from such a signification of a word
 that had been *Consecrated* by the Apostles,
 and

and he would do well to comfort himself with this Philosophick Consideration, as many great men have done in like Cases, that words have their Fate as well as Kingdoms, all things are subject to change in this World, and therefore as great Empires have their sudden falls, so may the greatest Words, they are exposed to time as well as Pyramids, and have one peculiar disadvantage that makes them more short liv'd than other Monuments, and that is that they are subject to Custom, and the casual usage of the People, *Quem penes Arbitrium est, & vis & norma loquendi* (as *Daillè* very well observes) that are the Sovereign Lords of Speech, and exercise an Arbitrary Power over all Parts of it: And therefore it is no such great wonder that any thing govern'd by such an inconstant thing as the People, should be as variable as themselves. And this may serve to appease *Daillè's* fears of losing a Word *Consecrated* by the Apostles. But as for his *Argumentum Palmarium*, that is yet more surprizing, when to load *Ignatius* with this appropriated signification of these words, he hath taken vast pains to prove not only that the Apostles themselves, but all the Writers of the first two hundred years used them both promiscuously of both Orders, sometime applying the

the word *Presbyter* to the higher Order, and sometime the word *Bishop* to the lower. And thus through his over eager pursuit of *Ignatius* hath he betray'd the whole Cause of Presbyterian Parity. For if there were an higher and a lower Order in the Church, then for ever farewell Presbytery; and yet that's the very thing that *Daille* so earnestly contends for, because he thinks it may do him great Service against *Ignatius*, and so for the present let it, for if that be granted, we will resign up *Ignatius* into his hands; for what need we stand so much upon a particular Author, to prove a thing that *Daille* himself hath demonstrated out of all the Writers of the Christian Church? So that the result of this great *Argumentum Palmarium* is no more than this, that indeed it is true that there ever were distinct Orders in the Church, but then they were not exprest by distinct words, as they always are in these Epistles. But if there were distinct Orders, it is enough, and as for the distinct use of words, that was not peculiar to *Ignatius*, but common to all the Writers after the Apostles, and that they should be so bold as to depart from their Language is not I hope so dangerous as the Learned Man would seem to make it. So unfortunate are Men that will be defensing

fending a Cause that will not be defended.

But though *Blondel* and his Associates durst not venture upon *Ignatius*, yet have they pressed his friend *Polycarp* into the *Geneva Service*, though the truth is, his Case is the same with that of *Clemens*, for it is plain that through the whole Epistle he followed the same stile and forms of Expression, and sometimes imitates him word for word, and therefore might after him use the word *Presbyter* in the promiscuous and Apostolical Sence ; for though they were before distinguish'd, as is plain from *Ignatius's* Epistles ; yet the newly appropriated signification of a word is not settled in a moment, but hovers for some time before it is universally entertain'd. And therefore though *Ignatius* used the words in the Sence of the present time, *Polycarp* for all that might use them in the sence that they had lately born. And yet of this there is no certainty at all, for it is more than probable that there was no Bishop at *Philippi* at that time, and for that reason they had sent to *Polycarp* for his advice in a certain business, for so himself informs us, that he wrote in Answer to their Appeal. And that was an usual Custom in the Primitive Church, if any thing of moment hap-

Pag. 14.

Apol.

Daille de

lib. supp.

lib. 21. 26.

p. 394.

happen'd in the time of vacancy, to refer it to the judgment of some neighbour Bishop. But granting that *Polycarp* used the word in the Apostolical Sence (though if he did, he was the last that ever did so) What follows ? Nothing but what I have shewn to follow from the same Observation, both in Scriptures and *St. Clement*, that when there was an Inequality of Power, there might be an Identity of Names. But *Blondel* would seem to argue from the Inscription of the Epistle : *Polycarp and the Presbyters with him, to the Church of Philippi* : And then immediately excuseth the Argument, and instead of urging it as a Proof, answers it as an Objection. This, says he, seems somewhat singular in this Epistle, that the holy Martyr should write in his own Name apart, and then of all his Presbyters in Common, whereby he seems to reserve a Preheminence to himself over his Presbyters, from whence it seems to follow that he was plac'd in a higher Order, and exercised a superiour Power over them. Truly this doth more than seem to follow, how then does *Blondel* avoid it ? Why he saith there may be divers other Reasons assign'd for it, and to this purpose he hath Coin'd a great many Conjectures out of his own Fancy : And if he
pleases

pleases I will allow him as many more, when it was certain that this was the only Reason, in that it is certain from the Testimony of *Irenæus*, his Cotemporary, that *Polycarp* was Bishop of *Smyrna* in the proper Sence and acceptation of the word, as himself was Bishop of the Church of *Lyons* in which he had been Presbyter ; so that in this Epistle we plainly find a Bishop with his Presbyters in the Church of *Smyrna*. But to say no more in so clear a Case, this single Epistle is as full a Testimony for Episcopal Supremacy, as all those of *Ignatius*, in that it particularly recommends them to the Church of *Philippi*, and therefore it both proves and approves that Ecclesiastical Order that is every where there described. So that if *Blondel* will allow *Polycarp's* Epistle to be genuine (and it was never question'd) it proves all that is asserted by *Ignatius*, and we will ask no more. If he will not, to what purpose doth he produce a Testimony of no Authority ? for if it be false it can do him no good, if it be true (as he owns it to be) he must admit *Ignatius* Epistles.

§. VIII. His next Testimony is out *Vid. Daille*
of *Hermas*. But to what purpose is it to *P. 397.*
appeal to the Testimony, when he rejects
the

the Witness? He condemns the Book as Counterfeit, Apocryphal, and of no Authority; and then appeals to it as if it were of that Antiquity that it pretends to. How strangely can Learned Men trifle when they will serve an ill Cause, to stuff up large Books with such Trash as themselves cannot but confess to be useless: and therefore though the Allegations out of this Author be as much beside the purpose as any of the rest, I need not trouble my self to disprove them, because *Blondel* hath done that for me, by rejecting the Author himself; for the Testimony of a Writing depends wholly upon the Credit of the Writer. But allowing the Author, and it is certain he was very ancient, let us hear his Testimony. The onely Passage in him to any purpose is this: *It sunt Apostoli, et Episcopi, et Doctores, et Ministri, qui ingressi sunt in Clementiâ Dei, et Episcopatum gesserunt, et docuerunt, et ministraverunt, sanctè et modestè Electis Dei.* Where saith *Blondel* he reckons onely two Orders after the Apostles, Bishops and Deacons; for the *Doctors* plac'd between them are to be reduc'd to the Bishops, because he says of them, that they manag'd the Episcopacy. That ever men should think to impose upon the World with such grossness as this! when here are so
expressly

expresly three distinct Orders reckon'd up, and three distinct Offices, Bishops that govern'd, Doctors that taught, and Deacons that ministred. So that he is so far from ascribing the Government to the Doctors, as *Blondel* affirms, that he limits their Office to the Work of Teaching, and appropriates that of Ruling to the Bishops; and it was an usual thing in the ancient Writers of the Church, to stile Presbyters by the Name of *Doctors*, because Teaching was their Employment.

Vid. Pearson vind. Ignat. p. 2. c. 13. p. 171.

Our next man is Pope *Pius*, where we have another Cast of *Blondel's* Ingenuity, to make use of *Pius* his Epistles when he thinks they may serve his Cause; whereas he believ'd before-hand that they were counterfeit, for that he hath endeavour'd to prove in his *Pseudo-Isidorus*; but what says Pope *Pius*? Why he calls the ancient Bishops that were acquainted with the Apostles, Presbyters. He doth so for their Age, not their Office. *Those old men that were Educated under the Apostles liv'd to our very time.* This he alledges to prove the certainty of the Apostolical Tradition. But the Case is very hard, that an ancient Bishop cannot be call'd an old man, but he must be immediately degraded into an ordinary Presbyter. And that this is Pope *Pius* his meaning, is evident from the

Other

Vid. Dallé p. 397.

Other Passage insisted upon by *Blondel*, in that Writing to *Justus* Bishop of *Vienna*, he saith, *Let the Presbyters and Deacons observe Thee, Non ut Majorem sed ut Ministrum Christi.* Where tho he carefully distinguishes the three Orders, yet notwithstanding that, *Blondel* will make his advantage of it: For though, says he, he Commands the respect of the Presbyters and Deacons to their Bishop, yet it is not as to their Superiour by Divine Right, but their Equal. What dealing is here with Antiquity, that one good Bishop cannot admonish another to exercise his Power with modesty and humility, but these men must presently strip him of it? Our Saviour Commands his Disciples that he that would be the greatest among them should be as he that ministers; does it therefore follow that there ought to be no Officers in the Christian Church greater than Others; or rather that the lowest Officer in it is the highest? Poor Presbytery, that after all this tugging hast nothing better to plead for thy self!

Our next Argument is, That the Church of *Rome* was govern'd by the Presbyters, when *Marcion* came thither in the Vacancy of the See, between the Death of *Pius*, and the Consecration of *Anicetus*. I will not

not contend about the Chronology. But if the See were vacant when there were so many Presbyters, then it was both something higher than the Presbytery, and possess'd by a single Person. So that here is another ancient Instance of a Church govern'd by a Bishop with his Presbyters ; and after his Death by the Presbyters till the choice of another Bishop. But though the Presbyters of old kept up the Discipline of the Church in the time of the Vacancy, and were accountable for it to the succeeding Bishops, yet they never pretended to Ordination, because that might be delayed for a time without any material Damage to the Church, whereas Discipline could not cease without subverting all Order.

* But from hence to infer that the Supreme Power of the Church is constantly and entirely in the Presbyters, is like all the rest of the *Blondellian* Arguments, in which the Conclusion always contradicts the Premises, for by the Premises the Supreme Power is in the Bishop, and in the time of Vacancy part of it in the Presbyters, and from hence

* *Cum incumbat nobis qui videmur Propositi esse, & vice Pastoris custodire gregem,* as the Clergy of Rome very well express their Duty in this case in their Epistle to the Clergy of Carthage, when their own Bishop was Martyr'd, and the Bishop of Carthage absent: *cyp. Ep. 3. Edit. Pam.* So that they had, as it were, no more than the Sequestration of the Episcopal Cure in the time of Vacancy.

H

the

the conclusion is, that therefore it is all and always in them: Or because there is no Bishop when he is dead, that therefore there is none when he is alive. Happy is the Cause that is defended by such Champions, it can never be yielded up whilst there is any such thing as Confidence in the World.

The next man is *Justin Martyr*, who reckons up but two sorts of Officers in the Christian Church, the Πρεσβύτερος, and the Deacons. But the disparity between Bishop and Presbyter was brought in before the time of *Justin Martyr's* writing, so that if there were any ground for *Justin Martyr's* inference of Parity, yet it is expressly against his own declaration, namely that for some years before, the disparity had prevail'd in all Christian Churches. But it is a very bold inference from the Description of Divine Worship in a Christian Congregation, to conclude any thing certain of the Form of Government over it. For whether there were a Parity or Imparity of Ecclesiastical Officers, it is certain that in every particular Church there must be one to preside and officiate, which might either be a Bishop or a Presbyter, for any thing that *Justin Martyr* intimates, who speaks only of their Form of Worship, and not of Govern-

vernment. Unless from the word *Πρεσβυτέρων* may be infer'd Episcopal Superiority, because (as Dr. *Hammond* hath very well observed) they are Synonymous in the Writers about that time, of which he hath alledged three remarkable Instances from *Dionysius* Bishop of *Corinth*, *Marcellus* Bishop of *Ancyra*, and the Council of *Ephesus*. But this, though it is much more than our Adversaries are able to make for themselves out of this Father ; yet I shall not insist upon it, but stand to this, that he is to be understood according to the Practice of his own time, and therefore there having always been an uninterrupted Succession of Bishops in the Church, or at least as *Blondel* confesses before his time, whatever he means by his *Πρεσβυτέρων* in a particular Congregation, he cannot be supposed ignorant of the Form of Government in the whole Church, though he had no Occasion to mention it in his Apology, which was address'd to Heathen Emperours to vindicate the Innocence of their meetings against false Informations, and that concerns onely their Forms of Worship in particular Congregations, and whether it were a Bishop or a Presbyter that presided, it was all one to the Emperor, if that were all.

*Dissert. 4.
c. 17. § 10,
11, 12.*

But in the next place *Papias* calls all Bishops, Presbyters. No, they are the Apostles he calls so. *If I met with any of the Followers of the Apostles I enquired of him after the sayings of the Ancients, What Andrew, what Peter, what Philip, what Thomas, or James, or John, or Matthew, or any of the Lord's Disciples were wont to say.* So that it is the Apostles themselves that he calls Presbyters, and for that Reason he calls them so, viz. because of their Antiquity, is so evident from the words themselves, that I cannot but stand amazed to see it so often repeated, and so long insisted on.

The next Testimonies are the *Gallican Church*, and *Irenæus*, in which *Blondel* seems most of all to insult, as his manner is, to be most confident when his Argument is weakest. For all the Proof he hath from the *Gallican Church*, is, that they stile *Irenæus* Presbyter, after he had been their Bishop many years : Be it so, yet however it is confessed, that upon the death of *Pothinus*, he that was before a Presbyter succeeded in the Bishoprick, and then a Bishop is a higher state than a Presbyter. But that they stile him Presbyter after he was a Bishop is a gross mistake in Chronology, in that *Blondel* would have him to have succeeded in the
seventh

seventh year of *M. Antoninus*, when it is certain that it was not till about 10 years after; till which time he was no more than a Presbyter. But it is strange that this Argument which is founded upon such an evident mistake should be so vehemently insisted on, when they so accurately distinguish in their Epistle between a Bishop and his Presbyter, always stiling *Pothinus* their Bishop, and *Irenæus* his Presbyter, who was not Bishop till afterwards. But it is stranger yet that *Irenæus* himself should be drawn into the Confederacy. What cannot a man prove the certainty of the Tradition of the Church, as *Irenæus* often doth, by the undoubted *Vid. Daille* Testimony of the Ancients, but they must *p. 395, 6,* all be immediately transform'd into Presbyters? And that he so frequently gives them that Title in respect of their Antiquity, not their Office, is so evident from the Passages themselves, that it is a burning shame for learned men to persist so stubbornly in so thick a mistake. Otherwise it is certain that he never confounds either the Name or the Office of Presbyter and Bishop, and derives the Succession of proper Bishops from the Apostles, such as the Bishops of *Rome*, and *Polycarp* who had their Presbyters under them, as is evident from the Inscription of *Polycarp's*

own Epistle, and the proceedings of the Presbytery at *Rome* against *Marcion*; neither indeed could he confound the Names, who so well knew the Distinction of Offices, as having been first a Presbyter himself, and then a Bishop. What an endless out-cry do these men keep up with *Irenæus* his Presbyters, as if they alone had been the immediate Successors to the Apostles, and he had known no higher Order of men call'd Bishops, when himself was advanced from the lower Order of Presbyter to that of a Bishop, when he has so often expressly distinguish'd them, so that if he had expressed himself carelessly, and sometime called a Bishop a Presbyter, it were nothing but wilful perverseness from thence to conclude that he knew no difference between them, and plainly to give the lye to his own Declaration of his own Sense; but when there is not one passage in all his Writings, in which he ever styles a meer Presbyter a Bishop; and when every passage in which a Bishop is stil'd a Presbyter, so apparently explains it self to be understood of their Age, not their Office; after this to interpret it of their Office, plainly shews that Presbytery has no other way to preserve it self, then by putting tricks upon Antiquity. Thus when in his Epistle to *Victor* he calls his
Prede-

Predecessors, Bishops of *Rome*, Presbyters that succeeded in the Government from the Apostles, what can be more evident then that he means thereby the Antiquity of their Succession ? for he is proving the Apostolical Tradition about *Easter* ; and this is demonstrated by its being derived from the Apostles themselves, by the most Ancient Bishops that presided in that Church after them. And the same is his meaning when he calls *Polycarp* an Apostolical Presbyter, (whom he elsewhere proves to be an Apostolical Bishop) and when he tells *Florius* that he never received his Opinions from any Presbyters, that were Disciples to the Apostles ; and so when he speaks of an Apostolical Presbyter that was his own particular instructor in the Traditions of the Apostles, it is plain to common Sense that he refers himself meerly to their Antiquity, without any the least regard to their Office ; thereby to prove the Truth of his Doctrine as derived down by the most Ancient Doctors in the Church from the Apostles themselves : And so he defines his Presbyters, *Qui cum Episcopatus Successione charisma veritatis certum accipere* : So that the Ancients who succeeded the Apostles, and delivered down the Tradition of the Church from them to after-

H 4

times,

times were undeniably the Ancient Bishops. Now if after all this the good old Bishop *Irenæus*, the great Assertor of the Episcopal Succession from the Apostles, must be made an old Presbyterian, and the very Father of the *Smeđtymnuans*, the time may come, when for writing this very Discourse, if it should happen to survive my self, I may (which God forbid) pass for a Presbyterian.

And why not ? when by the same Quibble they draw in Pope *Victor* himself, because in his Epistle to *Dionysius* Bishop of *Vienna*, he tells him that the Custom of keeping *Easter* was deriv'd from the Ancients, (Presbyters if you please) that had seen the Apostles in the flesh, and had govern'd the Church successively down to his time, and therefore desires him to enjoin its observation to the Presbyters of *France* ; and then salutes him and his Colledge at *Vienna*, in the name of the Colledge at *Rome*, from whence *Blondel* infers ;

First, That the Church was govern'd by Presbyters from the time of the Apostles to *Victor*, only because the *Ancients* that govern'd it, succeeded the Apostles in their Bishopricks.

Secondly, That the *French* Church was govern'd by Presbyters, because their
Pres-

Presbyters were govern'd by their Bishop, how else could he lay any injunction upon them?

Thirdly, That there were Colledges of Presbyters at *Rome* and *Vienna*, with *Victor* and *Dionysius*. Then there were Bishops with the Colledge of Presbyters.

The last Witness of the second Century is *Clemens Alexandrinus*, partly because he once call'd an Ancient Bishop that liv'd in *St. John's* time an old man, partly because he once speaks of Presbyters and Deacons without naming of Bishops, notwithstanding that in that very Passage he saith, that there was yet an higher Dignity: * and more than once reckons up three distinct Orders in the Church, founded by the Apostles in imitation of the Celestial Hierarchy.

Vide Daille
p. 396.

* Ἐπὶ καὶ
αἱ ἐν ταύ-
θα καὶ τῇ
ἐκκλησίᾳ
προσκοπᾷ
Ἐπισκό-
πων, πρεσβυτέρων, διακόνων, μιμήμεσθαι ὅμοιαι τῇ Ἀγγελικῇ δόξῃ.

Strom. l. 6. p. 667.

Thus far my Patience hath held out, for though such abusive trifling, is far from being worthy of any serious Confutation, yet because it is thought much more considerable than it is from the Authority and Reputation of the men who impose it upon the World, I thought good to let the People see after what a weak

weak rate the most learned men have oppos'd our Episcopal Constitution, that they may be no more abused with confidence and bold assertions. I have descended to the end of the second Century, because we are told of late, that there was no such thing as a Bishop in the Christian World for the first two hundred years. But with what Truth and Modesty sufficiently appears from the Premisses. But some men make as little Conscience of falshood, as they do of faction, and care not with what forgeries they abuse the ignorant People, so they can but keep up the Zeal and Confidence of their Par-ty.

§. IX. Here I thought I had done enough, and so once resolved to have concluded this Argument, because I supposed it correction more than enough to have taken down the presumption and confidence of our present Schismatics, and after that I was willing to spare all further Severity; but I find them so hardy in their own conceits that they scorn to accept of any Civilties. But instead of being thankful when their best friends are spared after sufficient correction, interpret it for cowardise and tergiversation. And Mr. B. is so vain as to set up this
Wonder

Wonder of the World, Blondel, (as he calls him) for the single and unconquerable Champion of the Cause, and to upbraid us with the poverty and defectiveness of our Answers to his *large Collections*. And both himself and their other Leading Writers are at this time so confident in transcribing and translating the *Blondellian* Quotations, as if they believed every thing in him of Canonical Credit and Authority. And in truth they follow him with such an implicit credulity, that they do not more impose upon the Peoples Ignorance, than he does upon theirs. Therefore though I have sufficiently demolisht the whole Work, yet seeing they will not yield up the Cause, whilst there is one stone left upon another, I will batter down all their pretences for two Centuries more ; and when that is done, there will appear nothing at the bottom but Sand and Confidence. And this task is so very easie, that it requires no labour but patience, and but little of that too, so fast shall we turn off his Authours.

Tertullian is his first man of the third Century, who though (as *Blondel* himself observes) he has often and expressly own'd the three Orders of Bishop, Presbyter, and Deacon in the Church, and the Supreme Authority of the Bishop over the whole

De Presc.

c. 41.

De Bapt.

c. 17.

De Monag.

c. 11.

De Fugâ.

c. 11.

De Presc.
c. 38.

De Monag.
c. 2.

whole Hierarchy, so that they are all obliged to be perpetually accountable to him for the legal discharge of their Office, and not to do any thing of moment in the Church, but by his leave and Commission : And though he has run up the Succession of single Bishops in the most eminent Churches to the Apostles themselves : And though he asserts the distinction of the several Orders in the Apostles own time, as when he affirms that *St. Paul's* precept for monogamy equally concern'd all Orders in the Church, Bishops, Presbyters and Deacons ; yet after all this must he be made a Patron of Presbyterian Parity for no other fault of his own, then because he affirms in his Apology, that at their Religious Assemblies the Elders of most reputation among them presided, being prefer'd to that dignity, not by bribes but worth. Now because there was a Bench of Elders admitted to the Government of the Church, from thence to infer after the above-mention'd premisses that there was no single Person presiding over this Bench, is no less than to give the broad Lye to *Tertullian* himself. When he has so often and so expressly told us, that there was one in every Church, endued with so much power over the Presbyterate, that they could

could act nothing in the Church, but in subordination to his Authority. The Argument then from *Tertullian* runs thus, That as often as he has occasion to enumerate the several Orders in the Church, he reckons up three, and those too as distinct in the Apostolical Age; but yet because he once speaks of the Officers of the Church in general, and does not enumerate the distinct Orders, and that for no other reason then because it would have been impertinent to his present Argument, therefore they were all equals, and there was no Order of Bishops distinct from and above that of Presbyters.

The next man is *Origen*, a man that has been used hardly through all Ages of the Church, and therefore 'tis no great wonder if he meet with hard usage from these men, who treat none of the Ancients with any great tenderness. So that though no man has more expressly own'd the distinction of Ecclesiastical Orders, and the Supremacy of Bishops, and that too in the Apostolical times, expounding St. *Paul's* precept of single Marriage, as then given to the several Orders of Bishop, Priest, and Deacon, yet because he once makes mention of only two Orders, viz. *Sacerdotium* & *Diaconum*, therefore it is concluded, that he knew no more, notwithstanding
that

that in the very same Passage, that is al-
 leged by *Blondel*, he distinguishes be-
 tween the Bishop and Presbyter in the
 Sacerdotal Order : For exhorting the Cler-
 gy both Sacerdotal and Ministerial to be-
 have themselves as became their place
 and dignity in the Church, he thus speci-
 fies his general Exhortation, *Give not men
 occasion to blaspheme, saying, Behold what
 a Bishop, or what a Presbyter, or what a Dea-
 con.* And then immediately adds, Is not
 this objected when the *Sacerdos* or *Mini-
 ster Dei* do not act as becomes their *Sa-
 cerdotal* or *Levitical* Order. Where it is
 evident, that in the Sacerdotal Order he
 distinguishes the Bishop and Priest, and
 only distinguishes the Order it self, that
 includes both from the Ministerial Office
 of Deacons, according to the common Al-
 lusion among the Ancients to the Mosa-
 ick Hierarchy, in which only the High-
 Priest and Priests were reckoned into the
 Priesthood, and not the Levites, with
 whom he here parallels the Deacons. But
 poor *Origen*, has had the hardest fate of
 any honest and learned man upon Record,
 that when he has been charged with all
 the Heresies in the World, that were in
 being in his time, he should at last be loa-
 ded with one, that was never started till
 long after his death. For *Aerius* that was
 the

the only Presbyterian among the Ancients lived not till towards the latter end of the fourth Century. And 'tis pretty odd in *Blondel*, that when all the Ancients but only one were against Presbytery, he has alledged all except that one for it, though the truth of it is he had very good reason to take no notice of him in his Catalogue, because he was branded for an Heretick by all the rest for his Opinion. It is (I know) pleaded by *Blondel* and some wiser *Præf. p.* men, that though *St. Jerom* and *Aerius* held *59.* the same Opinion concerning the Identity of Bishops and Presbyters, yet *St. Jerom* did not separate from the Church, but professed Canonical obedience to the Bishops, as lawfully establisht by Ecclesiastical Constitution; whereas the other turned Schismatick, and set up a Faction in the Church against his own Bishop, and that brought him into the Catalogue of Hereticks. But if this Apology were true, then all our separatists from the Episcopal Communion of the Church of *England* fall under the *Aërian* Heresie, whilst they do not only separate from it, but think themselves obliged to abolish it as utterly unlawful and destructive of Christs own Institution. For which enormity they have no countenance from *Blondel's* Arguments, and therefore when they
plunder

plunder them; they drive them farther then they will go. For all that can be drawn out of the *Sententia Hieronymi*, is only the Lawfulness of Presbyterian Parity, because it is not contrary to any Divine Institution, but from thence to conclude the unlawfulness of Episcopal Superiority, shews abundance of spight, but neither wit, logick; nor honesty. But then as for the Apology it self, it is true that *Aerius* his Separation made him a Schismatick, but it was his Opinion that branded him for an Heretick, and for that he is so esteemed by all the Ancients: And it is not a little observable that this was one of the latest Heresies in the Christian Church, when there was not an Article of the Christian Faith, that had not long before been the subject of variety of wild and odd Opinions. But it seems this form of Government in the Church from the Beginning, was thought so clear and unquestionable, that it never entred into any mans head to make any disturbance about it, till *Aerius* upon his repulse from a Bishoprick, to be revenged of his ill fortune, started it at the end of the fourth Century; neither do we find that it survived its Author, so little entertainment did it find in the Christian Church. And that St. *Jerom* was not reckoned an Heretick

tick for this Opinion, the reason of it is because he never held it, and if he had, he could never have escaped the Charge. For though he once or twice expresses himself loosely in this Argument, yet is it evident to any common ingenuity that he never in the least asserted an Equality between a Bishop and his Presbyters, but only a community of their Offices in the Priesthood, as distinct from the Ministerial or Levitical Office of the Deacons. Which as it is highly true in it self, so does it clear St. *Jerom* from all manner of suspicion of the *Aërian* Heresie.

As for the several Passages produced out of the Writings of St. *Cyprian*, and his correspondents, they are all no less then so many expresse proofs of the distinction of the three Orders, all which it was the custom of that Age to Assemble at all consultations about the Affairs of the Church. That Presbyters were and ought to be Assessours to the Bishop in the Government of the Church from the beginning, is so evident from all the most Ancient Records of it, that it will be as hard to find a settled Church govern'd by a Bishop without his Presbyters, as by Presbyters without a Bishop. And it seems the Deacons were by St. *Cyprian*'s time taken into some kind of share in the Government (probably by
I the

the interest of the Arch-Deacons who carried the bagg.) But when this Custom began I know not, neither do I remember any instance of it before St. *Cyprian's* own time, and it is likely that it was his own great modesty and civility that first began it. Though otherwise there is no man among all the Ancients, that has more expressly or strictly distinguished between the Authoritative and Ministerial Orders in the Church, and sub distinguished the Authoritative into Episcopal and Presbyterial, as I have already shewn from *Blondel's* own Quotations out of his Writings. And the distinction of the three Orders occurs so perpetually in every page of St. *Cyprian*, that to go about to prove from him that there were only two, this is not only to beg the conclusion, but (what is much worse) to steal it, and that with open force and violence against his own reiterated Protestations. This may suffice here for a general Answer to all his Citations from St. *Cyprian* and his friends, though I if would descend to the heap of particulars, they are but so many instances of the most shameless dissingenuity and falsification, as indeed the management of the whole Cause is from first to last. But I must not be too tedious, take therefore one instance for all

all, and that is the first of all out of the Epistle of the Clergy of *Rome* to the Clergy of *Carthage* : Who thus bespeak their Brethren, *Et cum incumbat nobis qui videmur præpositi esse, & vice Pastoris custodire gregem* : Seeing it lyes upon us, who seem to be the Rulers, and instead of the Pastor to keep the flock. That is, says *Blondel*, in *Christs* stead ; as if they had affirmed, that the Presbyters of each Church had acted next and immediately under Christ, without any subjection to their Bishop ; whereas this Letter is written upon supposition of his Superiority, for both Sees were at that time vacant, the See of *Rome* by the death of *Fabian*, and of *Carthage* by the flight of *St. Cyprian* ; upon which Occasion the Clergy of *Rome* write to their Brethren of *Carthage*, *We now seem to preside, and instead of the Pastor to take care of the flock*. That is in the absence of our Bishops, the care of the Charge lyes upon us, and in great modesty they avoid to express it positively, and only say that it seems to be so, and that too in the Pastor's stead, *i. e.* the Bishop's, who was then absent. And therefore for *Blondel* to drop in a Parenthesis after the word Pastor with our Saviour's name in it, is not to find but to forge a quotation. And if we strike it out, there is scarce a

Ep. 31.

more remarkable instance in all the Records of the Church of the Episcopal Supremacy, then in this Affair, as they explain themselves. For the same Clergy of *Rome* writing to *St. Cyprian* for his advice about the *Lapsi*, they tell him, *That they cannot proceed to a full and peremptory determination of the matter, for want of a Bishop to do it with Authority. Quamquam nobis differendæ hujus rei necessitas major incumbat, quibus, post excessum nobilissimæ memoriæ viri Fabiani, nondum est Episcopus propter rerum & temporum difficultates constitutus, qui omnia ista moderetur, & eorum, qui lapsi sunt, possit cum auctoritate & concilio habere rationem.* And to conclude, *St. Cyprian* himself challenges his own Episcopal Authority as founded upon nothing less than Divine Institution.

Ep. 27.

*Dominus noster cujus præcepta metuere & observare debemus, Episcopi honorem & Ecclesiæ suæ rationem disponens, in Evangelio loquitur & dicit Petro, Ego dico tibi quia tu es Petrus & supra istam Petram, &c. inde per temporum & successionum vices Episcoporum Ordinatio & Ecclesiæ ratio decurrit, ut Ecclesia super Episcopos constituatur, & omnis actus Ecclesiæ per eosdem præpositos gubernetur. Cum hoc itaque divinâ lege fundatum sit, miror quosdam audaci temeritate sic mihi scribere voluisse: "Our
"Lord,*

“ Lord, whose Commands we ought to
 “ reverence and obey, establishing the ho-
 “ nour of a Bishop, and the model of his
 “ Church, says to *Peter* in the Gospel,
 “ *Thou art Peter, and upon this Rock will*
 “ *I build my Church, I give thee the Keys*
 “ *of the Kingdom of Heaven, &c.* From that
 “ time forward the Succession of Bishops,
 “ and the frame of the Church was deri-
 “ ved down through all periods of times
 “ and seasons, so as that the Church should
 “ be founded upon the Bishops, and every
 “ Act of the Church should be govern’d by
 “ the same, seeing this Authority is esta-
 “ blisht by Divine Law, I wonder with
 “ what rashness and presumption some
 “ men should write to me, &c. An ad-
 “ mirable Patron this of *Blondel’s* Pari-
 “ ty.

But when he has made *St. Cyprian* a
 Presbyterian, he can never after that de-
 spair of bringing over any man to his
 party, and therefore next to him he Sum-
 mons in *Eusebius* himself, who of all the
 Ancients, next to *St. Cyprian*, not to say
 beyond him, is the strongest witness a-
 gainst the Presbyterian Cause. And yet
 even this man, that they have taken so
 much pains to prove the founder, or at
 least first Patron of *Ignatius’s* Epistles,
 that has given us exact Catalogues of the

Successions of Bishops in the most eminent Churches down from the Apostles themselves ; That has placed by the Apostles own hands, *St. James at Jerusalem, Erodus at Antioch, Clement at Rome, Anianus at Alexandria, Timothy at Ephesus, Titus at Crete, Polycarp at Smyrna, Dionysius at Athens, Epaphroditus at Philippi, Gaius at Thessalonica, Crescens in Galatia, &c.* And lastly that has preserved the most memorable passages in the first and most Ancient Writers, attesting the Government of the Church, by a Succession of single Bishops ; And yet this very man *Blondel* is not ashamed to produce both as a Witness and an Advocate for his Cause. But certainly one would expect very full and express assertions to convince us of so strange a Paradox ; for otherwise it will be very hard to induce men to a belief that ever *Eusebius* was a Presbyterian. And yet the strongest proof out of him is the old poor quibble of mistaking *Office* for *Age*. For quoting a Tradition concerning the Order, in which the Gospels were written, out of *Clemens Alexandrinus*, which (he says) he received from *Old Men of former times, i.e.* says *Blondel*, Presbyters : It may be so, and very likely most of them were so, but *Clemens* says no such thing, all that he

he affirms of them is, that they were *Old Men* of what quality or condition soever, whether Clergy or Laity. The next pretence out of *Eusebius* is from the Ordination of *Origen*, whom the two eminent Bishops *Theoctistus* of *Cæsarea*, and *Alexander* of *Jerusalem* judging worthy of the highest honour in the Church, they Ordain'd him Presbyter, therefore says *Blondel*, the Presbytery was the highest honour in the Church. What when he was placed in it by those that were in an higher, for they were Bishops that Ordain'd him ? But what miserable trifling is here with the Records of the Church, that when the Records report that though he were worthy of the Supreme, and Episcopal dignity, yet they only Ordained him Presbyter, from thence to infer, that by that alone he was prefer'd to the honour that he was thought worthy of, though it was not confer'd upon him, as it never was ? And yet by this slender piece of perverseness is this great Herald of the Episcopal Genealogies turn'd into a Presbyterian Leveller. The last passage out of *Eusebius* is misquoted, so that I know not where to find it, neither need I, when it is a peremptory Testimony of the distinction of the three Orders in the Church : The words are these, " There

“are three Orders in every Church, one
 “of Governours, two that are inferiour
 “and subject to them; and the People are
 “divided into two Classes, the Faithful
 “and the Catechumens. Now with what
 design *Blondel* should quote these words
 is beyond my imagination to conceive;
 he has not, as his usual custom is, tack’t
 any Inference to them, and therefore what
 he dream’t of when he alledged them, is
 now forever past discovery; for I dare
 say no man beside himself will ever be
 able to find out which way they can be
 brought to serve his purpose. And the
 truth is, these are such wild and rambling
 conceits, that I am very apt to suspect
 that the man was not in his right mind,
 and that he had out of his furious zeal
 to Presbytery overwatcht and overheated
 his head into some kind of phrensie,
 for I cannot believe that any man in his
 right Senses could have talk’d, much less
 written at such a roving and inconsistent
 rate.

The next evidence is St. *Hilary* of *Po-
 istiers*, because he distinguishes in the
Aaronical Hierarchy two Orders; the Sa-
 cerdotal, of which *Aaron* was head, and
 the Ministerial, which were Levites, and
 then applies this to the Christian Hierar-
 chy. I shall not put my self to the trou-
 ble

ble of proving St. *Hilary* to be of the same mind with all the foregoing Fathers concerning the Episcopal superiority, I fear I have done too much of that already in a Case so clear ; this passage alone is enough to do it, in which St. *Hilary* distinguishes the Priests from the Levites, and then divides the Priests into the High-Priest *Aaron* [*Sacerdos enim in lege primus fuit Aaron*] and the Priests that were comprehended under his name, and then adds, that so it is in the Christian Church ; and then there is no parity in the Priest-hood, but an High-Priest over the rest. His two next Witnesses, the Counterfeit *Ambrose*, and the Author of the Questions upon the Old and New Testament in St. *Austin*, we have examin'd already, and find that they only raise a Presbyter much above a Deacon, and place him next the Bishop, but upon a lower Bench, and that we see was a notion that run among all the Fathers, even when they divided the Clergy into three Orders, they still made something common to Bishop and Presbyter, that distinguish'd them from Deacons.

Thus far have I spur'd on my patience after it was quite tired, for though it gave out, and for a while lay down at the end of the first two hundred years, yet have

I forced it through two hundred more, with a resolution to have gone with him to his Journeys end ; but the way and work that I have already past is so infinitely dull and tedious, that I cannot prevail with my self to go any farther ; neither can I satisfy my self to what purpose I should, for when I have cleared the Records of the Church thus far, it is very little material what was done afterwards ; for if it were not done before, it is for that reason evident that it was no Apostolical Practice or Constitution. Besides, his Citations out of Authors of later date are of the same nature, and depend upon the same mistakes, and false reasonings that I have observed and discovered, in those that we have already consider'd. And I suppose I have by this time done enough to Caution our *English Smeectymnians*, for the time to come, not to swallow *Blondel's* Citations, and Authorities too greedily, when they are inform'd how enormously he imposes upon their Ignorance. And then I hope we may for the time to come enjoy peace and quiet from their disturbances, for I cannot think so ill of them, as that they will after full information go on to abuse themselves with such rank forgery, as they have hitherto done by their implicate faith in the honesty

neſty and ingenuity of *Blondel* and the
forreign Brethren.

§. X. And now having thus far and
fully proved the Divine Inſtitution, and
Apoſtolical preſcription of Episcopall ſu-
periority, our next enquiry is, after what
manner this Inſtitution was reduced to
practice. For ſeeing that Government is
a Practical thing, its inſtitution is no other
way to be ſo clearly underſtood, as by
comparing it with its Practice: So that
it is certain that the ſame way of Govern-
ment, that was always practis'd in the
Chriſtian Church was moſt agreeable to
our Saviour's Inſtitution. And by it we
may not only trace the method of their
Proceedings, but diſcern the reaſons upon
which they proceeded. And then if the
eſtabliſh'd Conſtitution of the Church of
England not only agree with the moſt
Ancient practice, but be founded upon
the ſame Reaſons, that, I hope, is enough
to place it above all Oppoſition. And as
by this method I ſhall make good mine
own Cauſe, ſo I ſhall preſcribe againſt all
other claims, for 'tis certain that was ne-
ver appointed that was never practiſed.
And therefore though it is no hard matter
for falſe pretenders to make ſome ſeem-
ing Pleas to a Divine Inſtitution, yet if
they

they can shew no example of their Claim in the Ancient Practice of the Christian Church, that is an insuperable Bar to all their pretences.

Thus for Example, when the *Romanists* pretend that the whole Government of the Christian Church was founded in the Supremacy of the Bishop of *Rome*, and plead Scripture for it, though I must confess they do it so wretchedly, that their own Arguments are the greatest shame to their own pretence. But supposing that they had any seeming Foundation for it in the Scriptures, yet because there is not the least Foot-step of any such practice in the Ancient Church for some hundred years, that's an undeniable demonstration that there never was any such Divine Institution, for if any such there had been, the Apostles would not have fail'd of conforming to it, and therefore when they do not, that shews that they had no such Command. Especially when if there were any such Institution, the whole Government of the Christian Church was bottom'd upon it, and therefore must have been settled in the first place; so that when we find nothing of it for so many Ages, it is evident that there never was any such thing, and therefore never ought to be. And as this prescribes
against

against *Roman* Tyranny, so it does against all sorts of Phanatick Anarchy, who all agree in this one Principle, that they will have no Order of Bishops superiour to that of Presbyters. But if they can give no certain instance of any Church since the Apostles, that was ordinarily govern'd by Presbyters without a Bishop, it is in vain for them to load their Margins with Texts of Scripture, or rather, as their Custom is, with figures of Chapter and Verse, (and indeed the meer figures for the most part signifie as much to the purpose as the words themselves.) For if the Supreme Government of the Church had been settled, as they say it was, by Christ and his Apostles, in a Common-Council of Presbyters, it is impossible but that most, if not all the Churches had at first conform'd to it. And therefore the Universal Practice of Episcopal Superiority in all known Churches, does as clearly demonstrate that there was no Divine Institution of Presbyterian or Independent Parity, as of Papal Tyranny. But when we first lay the Institutions of our Saviour and his Apostles for the Ground-work, and then draw upon them the practice of the Primitive Church, that will give us an exact Landskip of the true state of Christianity. For there
were

were few Churches brought to any kind of perfection in the Apostles time, perhaps none at all beside the Mother Church of *Jerusalem*, and therefore that state in which we find Churches when they were compleatly finished, we have reason to conclude most agreeable to the Apostles design, especially when we find all the known Churches in the World settled in the same form of Government, in which they left the Church of *Jerusalem*.

And in the first place there is nothing more evident in all the Records of the Primitive Church, than that the Apostles, and first Doctors of the Christian Faith endeavour'd as far as they were able, to model the first settlement of Churches according to the present State and Division of the *Roman* Empire. For though our Blessed Saviour settled the Supreme Government of his Church upon the Apostles, and their Successors ; yet he nowhere prescrib'd the Bounds and Limits of every man's Jurisdiction, but left it, as indeed the Nature of the thing required, to their own Prudence to divide their Provinces among themselves. And accordingly we find from the very beginning, that they form'd the Jurisdiction of Churches according to the Civil Judicatures of the Empire. And this they did
with

with special regard to the Interest of Civil Government, that they might not be any occasion of making Alterations or Disturbances in the State, which could scarce have been avoided, had they not cut them out by the same Pattern and Model. For if the Jurisdiction of Churches had been of a larger extent then the Civil State, it would be in their power to hamper the Civil Government as they please, and if they please destroy it. For if their Jurisdiction extend beyond its bounds, then it could exercise it out of its Territories, and then if it have power to Summon its Members (as if it have any it hath that, and if it be a Church it must have some) it might cite all, or any of his Subjects out of its Dominions, and then they are no longer Subjects than as themselves please. So that the very nature of Civil Government limits the extent of Churches; and when our Saviour Commanded his Apostles so to plant them in all Kingdoms and Common-wealths, as not to abate the Rights of the State wherever they came, that alone bound them to limit the bounds of Churches to the bounds of the Civil Government. And so we find all Christendom model'd before any Civil Power concern'd it self in its settlement; and *Constantine* found it so well order'd,

order'd, for compliance with the Civil State of the Empire, that he made no Alteration in that, till he did in this ; and then indeed it follow'd too fast of its own accord, as we shall see hereafter. So as the Soul is convey'd into the Body, so as to conform it self to the same shape and bulk, without any other change, but giving it Life and Activity, Christianity was brought into the Civil Government, so as to give it new strength and vigour by all those precepts of Obedience and Loyalty, that it binds upon the Consciences of all Subjects ; but as for the Body of the State, it was punctually to conform it Self and its Discipline to the very same mold. And this we shall find practised in the Primitive Church according to all the Divisions and Sub-divisions of Government in the Empire.

§. IX. The first and lowest Church-Society is a Bishop with his Presbyters presiding over a City and its adjacent Territories ; for that was the first Division of Power in the *Roman* Empire, as it was in the Jewish State, and as in most Nations a Judge with his Officers, and their Assistants residing in every City, and extending their Jurisdiction over the adjoining Country. And that is the definition

definition of a Territory in the Civil Law.

Territorium est Universitas agrorum infra Pandect. fines cujusq; Civitatis : quod ab eo dictum § 8. lib. quidam aiunt, quod magistratus ejus loci 239. F. de intra eos fines terrendi, id est, summo- verb. signi. vendi jus habet.

In Conformity to which the Apostles every where planted Churches in Cities, which sooner or later, as they succeeded in their works, took in all the Country about, appertaining to the Circuit of the City. This is both the narrowest and the largest acceptation of the word Church, excepting the Catholick

Church, that we meet with in Antiquity ; * for we never find any other mention of a Church in Scripture, as the Church of Rome, the Church of Ephesus, the Church of Antioch, the Church of Jerusalem ; in which Churches though there were divers Officers, and therefore several Congregations (for if there had been but one, as some have the Confi-

And this is confessed by Blondel himself. *Apol. Præfat. p. 76. Ne cui in mentem veniat fideles cujuscunque civitatis incolas pro titularum in quibus eos convenire mos est, numero plures ecclesias constituere, sed unius membra censei debere, altæ mente reponendum est Apostolos sive Hierosolymis, sive Antiochia, sive Corinthi, ubi plura debebant Christianorum millia, & numerosi erant ordinis confessus plures nec ecclesias nec confessus constituisse, sed κατὰ πᾶν unicum, nec alium posse fuisse aut esse debuisse (Christo ipso judice) piorum morem, cum Christianorum per singulas Asiæ civitates frequentiores cætus nisi quam in plures ecclesias et presbyteria dispartiri sint, sed unicam uniuscujusque loci ecclesiam unicum confessum*

constituerint, Ephesi Ephesinam, Smyrnæ Smyrnensem. Which utterly overthrows the grand Plea of our present Non-Conformists that would confine the extent of Churches to personal Communion (as they call it) or single Congregations.

dence to affirm, to what purpose such a number of Officers ?) yet but one Church. So that the bare mention of so many Officers in one Church is an undeniable prescription against all the pretences of Independent Congregations. For if there were distinct Congregations, as it is evident there was, both from the number of Christians, and of Church Officers ; yet the Title of Church is never given to any of them, but only to the whole Body appertaining to the City ; and therefore it is observable that they are Synonymous in Scripture, Ordaining Elders in *every Church*, *Act. 14 23.* is the same with Ordaining Elders in *every City*, *Titus 1. 5.* So little do the Enemies of Episcopacy gain by finding out Presbyteries in Scripture ; for that plainly demonstrates the larger extent of Churches, unless we will be so absurd as to affirm that every single Congregation was taught and govern'd by an Assembly of Divines. And as we do find no Church of one Denomination of less extent than a City, and its Territories, so neither do we find any of a greater, excepting the Church Catholick ; for when the Scripture speaks of any larger Society of Christians, as of a Province, or a Nation, it is always (as has often been observed by Learned men) in the Plural

Num-

Number; as the Churches of *Judæa*, the Churches of *Syria*, the Churches of *Cilicia*, the Churches of *Galatia*, the Churches of *Asia*, in that those Provincial Churches were made up, as I shall shew anon, of a Combination of Diocesan Churches. And agreeable to these plain intimations of Scripture is the whole practice of Antiquity, for there is not one Instance of any one Church upon Record, either of a narrower or a wider extent. 'Tis true, that the beginnings of Churches were for the most part laid in Cities, as every thing must begin some where ; but we find not the mention of any Church as fix'd and finish'd in any Ancient Record, but of the same extent with the Civil Government over a City and its Territories. Some learned men I know distinguish between the two Periods of the Christian Church, the first when Churches and Cities were of the same extent ; the second when Churches took in the adjoining Villages belonging to the Cities. But this is a meer Metaphysical distinction of their own Creating, without any Foundation in the History of the Church. For no man can assign any time, when the Extent of a Church was confin'd to the inhabitants of a City, or when City Churches began to take in

the Inhabitants of adjoining Villages. For though the Gospel was for the most part first preached in Cities, because of the greater number of people there, and the easie way of propagating it thence into the Country, by reason of its Natural and Civil dependence upon them ; yet that there was ever any design of limiting Churches to the People of a City ; nay, that there ever was any such time that they were actually so limited, there is not any the least intimation in all the Records of the Church. So that if it ever happen'd to be so in any place, as it was meerly accidental, so was it of very short duration. For it is possible that at the first preaching of the Gospel in any City, none but the inhabitants of it might be present, and so the Converts of that time might make up the Church of that City ; and so it is possible that some of the Apostles, or first Preachers of Christianity might have first preached in a Village, (and *St. Clement* says so they did) and so the Church might for that time have been confin'd to it. But if a Church were ever limited to a particular place, it could be but for a very short time, especially in Cities, whither People continually resorted out of the neighbour Villages, and therefore were as likely to be present at
the

the Apostles first Sermons as the Inhabitants themselves, and then if any of them were Converted they belong'd to the Church of that City, and then the Church was never confin'd within the Walls. And that this was the Ancient State of the Church is evident from *Justin Martyr*, who expressly informs us, that in his time on *Sundays* all the Christians that dwelt *κατὰ πόλεις καὶ ἀγροὺς* in City and Country Assembled together for Religious Worship. But how small soever the beginnings of Churches might chance to be either in City or Country, it is evident that no Church stop'd the bounds of its Jurisdiction till it had taken in the City, and all its Territories. For that was the extent of all the Churches that we find settled in the Christian World, when they were brought to their lasting State and full Perfection. And that's a clear Argument that this was the State of the Church that was design'd from the Beginning, and that for this Reason, that when the Powers of the World should come in to own Christianity, a regular and uninterfering correspondence might be maintain'd between both States, Civil and Ecclesiastical, for by this means when any man became Christian he remain'd in the same Capacity toward the Civil Go-

vernment, in which he stood before, which otherwise he could not have done.

This being the first Model of a Church, a Bishop with his Presbyters in a City and its Territories ; the fundamental Rule of their Government was this, *That nothing was to be done without the Bishop* : This we all know was the main injunction in all *Ignatius* his Epistles, and this was the universal Practice of the Catholick Church. And hence in the 31 Apostolical Canon it is decreed, That if any Presbyter shall separate from the Communion of his Bishop, and erect another *Altar*, he shall after three Admonitions be deposed for his Ambition and Affectation of Tyranny, and that very properly, because 'tis certain that all Rebels would be Tyrants too. And the same is decreed by the Council of *Antioch*, Canon 5 ; with this addition of Severity, That he shall be for ever deposed without capacity of Restitution ; and that the Secular Power shall be called in to punish him as a mover of Sedition. And in the 39 Apostolical Canon, Presbyters and Deacons are commanded to do nothing in the Church without the Bishop's consent ; and *Ignatius* reckons up in his Epistle to the Church of *Smyrna* the several Particulars that they ought not to do without him,

not

not Baptize, nor Offer, &c. * And this was the Custom of the Primitive Church : Especially as to Baptisme *Tertullian* is a positive Witness, *Baptismum dandi habet jus summus Sacerdos, qui est Episcopus, dehinc Presbyteri & Diaconi, non tamen sine Episcopi Auctoritate*, The Chief Priest,

that is the Bishop, hath the Power of granting Baptism, and after him the Presbyters and Deacons, but not without the Bishop's Authority. This fundamental rule of Episcopal superiority being established, it is not much material to enquire after what manner the Bishop and the Clergy exercised their Authority among themselves ; whether they settled distinct Congregations under their proper Pastors, or whether they govern'd the whole Church in Common. Because these things depend principally upon Chance and accidental Convenience, and they might do either as was most suitable to the Present State of the Church : In the Church of *Jerusalem* there must have been several Congregations from the beginning, because the great Number of Converts ex-

* Μηδεὶς χωρὶς τοῦ Ἐπισκόπου τι προσηύεται ἢ ἀνηκόρτων εἰς τὴν Ἐκκλησίαν. Ἐκείνη βεβαία Εὐχαριστία ἡ γείδω, ἡ ὑπὸ τῷ ὁπίσκειν ἔσται, ἡ ὅτι ἂν αὐτοὶ ὁπίσκειν. Ὅπως ἂν φανῇ ὁ ὁπίσκειν, ἐκεῖ τὸ πλῆθος ἔσται, ὡς περ ὅπου ἂν ἡ Χρῖστος Ἰησοῦς, ἐκεῖ ἡ καθολικὴ ἐκκλησία. Οὐκ ἔξδν ἐσιν χωρὶς τοῦ ὁπίσκειν, ἔτε βαπτίζειν, ἔτε ἀγάπην ποιεῖν, ἀλλ' ὅτι ἂν ἐκεῖν δοκιμάσῃ, τότε καὶ τὸ θεῶν ἐνδύσονται, ἵνα ἀσφαλὲς ἦ καὶ βέβαιον πᾶν ὁ προσηύεται.

ceeded the bounds of a single Congregation. And therefore at first they took a common care over the whole Body of the People, dividing the work among themselves, but assembling principally in the City Church, whither the Inhabitants of the Country repair'd for Divine Worship. For while the Number of Christians was but small in Country Villages, some few perhaps in every Village, it was proper for them to resort to the Communion of the City Church : But when that Christianity prevail'd over the World, and that there were Christians enough in every Village to make up a sufficient Congregation, then was it proper to set up fixed Pastors in particular Parishes : But when ever that was done, for the time is very uncertain, it is certain that they were form'd and instituted in subordination to the Ancient state of the Church ; and therefore were not independent in themselves, but subject to the Bishop and his Presbytery as they had been from the beginning. So that the late beginning of Parishes and distinct Congregations, especially in the Country (for as it hath been often observed by learned men, we find no mention of Country Presbyters till about St. *Cyprian's* time) is another evident prescription against Independency.

In

In that before that time all the Churches in the Diocess were immediately dependent on the Bishop and his Presbyters, and that they were so then and ever after is a thing so well known, that the Man that should begin the Proof of this as an inviolable Rule of the Church at *St. Cyprian*, without ascending higher, might as well spare his Ink and Paper, and does but a needless and a thankless Office to the Cause of Episcopacy : Thankless because if he be not able or willing from thence to rise higher to the first Age of the Church, he gives up its Title from Divine Right : Needless because its possession by humane Right before and at that time is so notoriously evident, that if any man should desire to have it proved, he would more deserve to be hissed at, than confuted. But if any man desire to consult the several passages in the Ancients, especially *St. Cyprian*, relating to this Rule of having but one Bishop in a City and his Territories, he may find them amass'd together by *Blondel* himself, p. 188. 189.

§. X. And therefore I shall rather choose to give an Account of the Conformity of the Church to this Rule, as far as it was able, in its ordinary Practice. For in Cases of Necessity, it cannot be help'd if
men

men cannot have what they would have done. And therefore no such Examples ought to be any prejudice to a standing Rule. So that whereas learned men dispute whether in the Apostles time there were two distinct Churches of Jews and Gentiles ; and by consequence two Bishops, is very little if at all material to the Controversie. For if the Apostles ever set up two Communion in any Place (though of that there is no competent evidence) they were forc'd to it by the furious prejudices of the Jews, who for some time would not be wrought off from their old deep rivited conceit, that it was not lawful to join in any Worship with a Gentile. This I find the greatest difficulty that the Apostles encountred in founding Churches ; so that it is not to be much wondred at if they suffer'd themselves to yield to it for some time, till they could perswade them out of it. And that I am sure was not long, for we hear nothing of any such thing after the Apostles themselves. Though for my own Part I am apt to think, that there was never any such form'd and settled Communion. For though the Apostles were at first forc'd somewhat to condescend to the niceness of the Jews, yet it is very probable that they overcame the fondness
of

of their conceit, before they proceeded to the final settlement of Churches. But that they any where fixed any distinct Communion I know no sufficient ground to induce any man's belief, but much against it; for this controversie between the Jewish and Gentile Believers was chiefly agitated in the Church of *Antioch*; and when it was refer'd to the determination of the Apostles, *Act. 15.* they were so far from any compliance with the Waywardness of the *Jews*, in forcing the *Gentils* to a Submission to the whole Law, that they injoynd but three or four particulars, *viz. That they abstain from Meats offer'd to Idols, from Blood, from things Strangled, and from Fornication*: And upon these terms require the Church of *Antioch* to receive them to Communion; so far were they from instituting two distinct Communion, as *Baronius*, and after him others conceive, that they required all to enter into one Communion upon these terms, which was joyfully received, and by consequence obeyed by the whole Church, *v. 31.* And when they here Condemn'd the *Jews* that would make the observation of the Law of *Moses* necessary, as disturbers of the Peace of the Church, and subverters of Mens Souls, *v. 27.* It is by no means probable that they would in any other

*Martyrol.
not. ad Feb.
1.*

other Churches so much gratifie men of the same Principles, as out of compliance with them to neglect or indanger the Unity of the Church: When according to the Sentence they had passed upon them at *Antioch*, they could be no better then Schismatics all the World over. The only seeming difficulty that I know of, and once thought a real one, is the duplicates of the first Bishops after the Apostles, and in particular *Linus* and *Clemens* at *Rome*: But the Case of those Apostolical men was the same with that of the Apostles themselves, they were not settled Bishops of any particular See, but of the Catholick Church, and so where-ever they fix'd for any time, they were accounted of as the first Bishops of that See. And thus might *Linus* and *Clemens* be both esteem'd Bishops of *Rome*, as *St. Peter* and *Paul* were, in that both of them some time or other presided in that Church, and that perhaps either together, or at various times, as they happen'd to move in the discharge of their Evangelical Office. And thus any Church might happen to have many Bishops without distinct Communions, because the Bishops at that time were not fix'd, so that when two Evangelists chanced to meet together in one City, they were both
reckon'd

reckon'd Bishops of it, because they had both Apostolical Authority. But when Churches came to be settled upon their lasting foundation, then the standing Rule was one Bishop over a City and its Territories.

Thus in the 12th. Apostolical Canon, when provision is made that a Person Excommunicated in his own Diocese may not be received in another, it is decreed that he shall not be received in *another City*, as *Synonymous* with Diocese; and so by his being kept out of Communion with the Church, appertaining to every City, he was effectually and entirely Excommunicate out of the whole *Christian Church*. And so in the 8th. Canon of the first general Council at *Nice* it is provided, That if any *Novatian* Bishop return to the Communion of the *Catholick Church*, he may be allow'd the Title and Honour of a Bishop, but nothing of the Power and Jurisdiction *ἵνα μὴ ἐν τῇ πόλει δύο Ἐπίσκοποι ὦσιν* that there may not be two Bishops in the same City. And accordingly they proceeded in their *Synodical Epistle* against *Meletius*, who had presum'd to ordain after his Deposition by a Synod of Bishops, allowing him the bare Title of Bishop in his own City, but charging him to exercise no Authority, especially of Ordinati-

Soc. l. i. c.

19.

Soc. l. i. c.

24.

on

on μήτε ἐν πόλει μήτε ἐν κώμῃ, either in City or Country. And the same was done by the Council at *Ephesus* in a *Synodical* Epistle to a Synod of the Province of *Pamphilia* upon this occasion. *Eustathius* having been Elected into the Metropolitan Bishoprick of the Province, and being tir'd out with many Vexatious Suits and Troubles in it, resign'd it; upon which the Provincial Synod chose *Theodorus* in his place. Now when the See was full *Eustathius*, that had depos'd himself, makes his application to the Council, who observing the Meekness and the Modesty of the Man, pitied his Case, as much as the Canons, and Constitutions of the Church would permit, and therefore Wrote to the Bishops of the Province to give him all that Respect that was due to his Order, but reserving the whole Jurisdiction to *Theodorus*.

Another remarkable Instance of this was *Liberius* Bishop of *Rome*, who had been banish'd his See by *Constantius* for his Zeal against *Arianism*, and *Felix* chosen in his Place; but addresses being made to the Emperour in his behalf, either by the Court Ladies, as *Theodoret*, or by the Western Bishops, as *Sozomen*, he was prevail'd upon to command his Restitution, enjoyn-
ing him to govern it joyntly with *Felix*.

But

But the People (say the Historians) laughed at the Emperours Letters ; and tho' the several Parties divided in adhering to the several Bishops , yet they both agreed in this common Outcry, εἰς Θεός, εἰς Χριστός, εἰς Ἐπίσκοπος, one God, one Christ, one Bishop. And so upon *Liberius* his Return *Felix* (says *Theodore*) remov'd from *Rome* to some other City ; but *Sozomen* says, He immediately departed this Life by the special Providence of God , to preserve the Honour of *St. Peters* See , and the Constitution of the Antient Church, that two Bishops might not sit in the same Throne ; So that it is probable from both, that at *Liberius* his Return *Felix* withdrew and soon after Died. And so in the 13th. Canon of the Council of *Calcedon* , it is Enacted, That no *Clergy-man* Officiate in another City without commendatory Letters from his own Bishop, where it is evident that Diocesses were *Synonymous* with Cities , and that the prohibiting them to Officiate in any other City, was the same thing as prohibiting them to Officiate at all. And much the same provision is made by the Council of *Antioch*, That if a Bishop could not repair to his own Episcopal See, being hindred either by the *Faction* of the People , or the Incurfions of the *Barbarians*, that in that Case he might be allow'd

Can. 18.

Can. 94.

low'd the Title of a Bishop, and have the liberty of Officiating in the Church in another Bishops Diocess till further order, but by no means to meddle with any thing of the Jurisdiction. And so in the Council of *Carthage*, the Bishops are enjoyn'd to endeavour the Conversion of their own *City i. e.* Diocess. And so in all the Canons of the ancient Councils, that forbid the Translation of Bishops from a lesser Diocess to a greater; it is express'd by removing from one *City* to another. I might add numberless Instances, more especially those several ancient Canons, that enjoyn the Bishop to reside in his *City Church*, and not in any other Part of his Diocess. But these are more than enough to demonstrate the Primitive ground and Apostolical Constitution of *Diocesan Churches*; that as they made Cities the Seats of Bishopricks, so they design'd to extend their Jurisdiction over the adjacent Country, when Cities and Churches were made *Synonymous* in the Apostles time, and when in the time of their earliest Successors Churches were compleatly settled, the Territories adjacent to the Cities were always involv'd in the Churches planted in them.

§ XI. The only difficulty that remains is, the Case of the *Chorepiscopi*, of whom it is much disputed among learned Men, whether they were true and proper Bishops, or only Presbyters, authoriz'd not by *Ordination* but *Deputation* from the Bishop. Though the Controversie about them is very little material to the Cause of Apostolical Episcopacy, because of their late beginning in the Christian Church; and therefore because our Enquiry is after the first Constitution of this, I have confin'd my search to the three first Centuries, and what Ecclesiastical Practise soever is not to be found in them; I conclude it to be no Apostolical Constitution: So that seeing we hear nothing of these *Chorepiscopi* till the fourth Century: It is from thence evident, that they were not known to the Primitive Church, though *Blondel* and *Walo* are pleas'd to make them an Apostolical Constitution; according to their constant custom of perverting, and indeed flatly belying the plain sence of all Antiquity. For it is not only without any Foundation in the Records of the ancient Church, but it's Notoriously contrary to it's whole Practice: For the first time we meet with any such Office, (as *Blondel* himself hath confess'd, because he

Page 33
Page 302

Page 35

L

could

Can. 13.

could not deny it) is in the Council of *Ancyra*, in the year 314, or 315. And as they were brought in at first by Humane Authority, so were they at last abolish'd by the same. But beside their late standing in the Church, there is another thing that makes their Cause scarce worth the enquiring into, and that's the Imperfection of the first Record concerning them, that is the Canon of *Ancyra*, that hath suffer'd such a mutilation, as destroys it's Sense; however I will endeavour to State their Case as well as I can, because now I am in, I would give at least a full Historical Account of the Practice of that which we now call *Diocesan Episcopacy*.

Now here the *Papists* and *Presbyterians* agree, as they do in every thing else against the right Constitution of the Primitive Church; that they were not proper Bishops but Presbyters, deputed by the Bishop to exercise all Parts of his Episcopal Authority; by which the *Papists* gain this, that any Presbyter may take upon him the Office of a Bishop, by Delegation from our Sovereign Lord the Pope, and then it is in his Holinesses Power, to turn all the Bishops in the World out of Office when ever he pleases to send out his Delegates into all their Diocesses; And that is the true Bottom of *Popery* to make the Bishop
of

of *Rome* the only Bishop, or rather all the Bishops in the World. And therefore we do not find any one Tenet more unanimously asserted by the Divines of that Church. Here the very *Schoolmen*, that wrangle about all things else, are one and all, *Thomists* and *Scotists*, *Nominals* and *Realls* agree that Episcopal Consecration does not give any new Order, but is only an extension of the old. Though here they abuse themselves, as they do every where, by a meer empty word; for if it gives a new Power, as they acknowledge it does that of Ordination, then here is a distinct Order of Men entrusted with that Power, and that's all, for it is the Power that makes the Order, and without that, the Order is nothing more than a *Scholastic Cobweb*. The *Presbyterians* on the one side think they gain this, that a Bishop and a Presbyter are the same Order, as having both the same Essential Power, but that the exercise of it in Presbyters hath been sometimes restrain'd by Canonical and Ecclesiastical Constitutions, and sometimes allow'd as in the *Chorepiscopi*, tho' granting that they were no more than Presbyters; besides that they are a Novelty in comparison of the Apostolical Church, I cannot see how it affects the Cause of Episcopal Superiority.

For tho' they were Presbyters, yet it is evident, that they did not pretend to the Episcopal Function, by virtue of their own Order but their Bishops Authority; And therefore this very custom were enough to prove the distinction of the Orders by it self: But whether a Bishop may lawfully depute a Presbyter by his Commission to execute his Office is another Question; for whether he may or may not, it is evident either way, that he has a Superiority of Power over him, and that too is enough. But the truth is, this whole matter is very clearly determined by those two great Men, Mr. Thorndike and the Arch Bishop of Spalato, if compar'd together: For says Mr. Thorndike,

*The right of
the Church,
C. 3 p. 146.* Suppose Presbyters were ordain'd by Presbyters upon Commission from the Bishop, is this any Prejudice to the Rule that nothing be done without the Bishop? or is it any Advantage to them, that would have no Bishops, and so do all against the Bishop? To my Reason it seems necessary to distinguish between the Solemnity which an Act is executed with, and the Power and Authority by which it is done. And that it cannot be prejudicial to any Power to do that by another, which it seems fit (i.e. thinketh not convenient) to be Immediately and Personally Executed by it self. The dependence
of

of the Church being Safe by the Commission acknowledg'd, and the Unity of the Church by that Dependence. And it is certain, that the Efficacy of the Solemnity, *i. e.* the promise and the Conveyance of the Divine Grace, is not annex'd to the Act, but the Authority; For it is not the Bishops hand that conveys any thing into the Person ordain'd, but the immediate Grace of God, which he hath promis'd to the performance of the outward Solemnity. So that tho' it be not executed by him in Person, yet so it be by his Authority; Our Saviours design for the Unity of his Church, in the Institution of Episcopal Superiority is preserv'd. But because when he Vested his Apostles with this Power, he hath no where given any licence to trust it's Execution with others that have it not, and the Apostles accordingly attended it in their own Person; no Bishop hath any clear Warrant to entrust his Episcopal Authority in any other hands, notwithstanding that perhaps it may be lawfully done.

And therefore the Arch Bishop of Spalato allowing its lawfulness Subjoyns, *quamvis talis delegatio, mihi plurimum sit suspecta; non enim puto Episcopum posse ordinationes per alium exercere, qui non sit Episcopus.* And yet I must confess, that I
DeRep.Ec.
lib. 2. c. 9
§ 18.

cannot but very much suspect such delegations, for I cannot understand how a Bishop can Exercise his Power of Ordination by one that is no Bishop. And therefore tho' it may be lawful, yet because it is not warranted either by Law or Prescription; it is much more safe and adviseable to forbear it. For I never find it designedly put in practice any where in the Christian Church, till of late in the Church of *Rome*. But as for the *Chorepiscopi* in the earlier Ages of the Church, I cannot see that they were any thing less than true and proper Bishops, that were plac'd as Coadjutors to the City Bishop, in the remote parts of the Territories of great Diocesses, where they were empowr'd to Execute the Episcopal Office, as he should Order and Advise, so that tho' they had an intrinsic power of giving Priestly Ordination, yet this was restrain'd by Canonical Constitution. And that is the best proof of their Episcopal Character, their Power of Ordination: For in those days when we first read of them, and when Canons were first made concerning them, no man ever so-much as dream't of Ordinations by Presbyters and Delegations, that was a late trick of the School-men to beat down all other Bishops, and advance the Bishop of *Rome*; but in the
earlier

earlier Ages of Christianity, in which the *Chorepiscopi* were settled, there is no foot-step of any such thought as Ordaining by Delegations, and therefore those ancient Canons that own this Power in them, but restrain it's exercise within Subordination to the City *Diocesan*, suppose them true and proper Bishops. That which makes confusion in this matter is the Corruption of the 13th. Canon of *Ancyra*, in which we first meet with the *Chorepiscopi*, and of which the most correct Greek Copies run thus. *That it shall not be lawful for Countrey Bishops to Ordain Presbyters or Deacons, nor yet for City Presbyters without the permission of their Bishop.* Which reading being apparently absurd and against the whole Practice of the Church at that time, that even Presbyters might Ordain, with leave from the Bishop; it is unanimously rejected by almost all Learned Men, and the true reading is fetch'd from some of the old *Latin* Translations, that run thus. *It shall not be lawful for the Countrey Bishop, to Ordain Priests or Deacons, nor for City Presbyters to do any thing in the Diocess, without Authority from the Bishop by Commission in Writing.* And so the whole Canon runs clear, the Countrey Bishops being thereby restrain'd from Ordaining Priests and Deacons with-

out the Bishops leave, and City Presbyters from doing any thing else without his consent. And the same is provided for by the 65 Canon of *Laodicea*, which was made in pursuance of this, That the Priests should not so much, as begin Divine Service in the Church till the Bishop came, without his leave. And it is the same that is injoin'd by all *Ignatius* his Epistles, and the Canons of the Ancient Church, that nothing be done without the Bishop; and therefore this Canon must be reduc'd to that sence, else we can never reconcile it to it self, and the universal Practice of the Church. And so it was read in the time of *Charles* the Great, who in his Capitular at *Aix la Chapelle* thus expresses the sence of it. *Ancyronense* (as he calls the Council) *Vicariis Episcoporum, quos Græci Chorepiscopos vocant, non licere Presbyteros vel Diaconos ordinare. Sed nec Presbyteris Civitatis sine Episcopi præcepto amplius aliquid jubere: vel sine Auctoritate literarum ejus in unaquâque parochiâ aliquid agere.* So that when *Walo* will from this main'd Canon infer, that before that time it was lawful for City Presbyters to Ordain; methinks a man of his endless reading would have done well to have given one instance of it in all the Records of the Church. But when the whole practice

Office of the Church was so apparently contrary, he would have done much better, and more like an able Critick to have corrected his Copy by it, (especially when its true meaning was so clearly pointed out by the most Ancient versions) than to stick to an evident mistake because he would not part with his Opinion, though it is still greater stubbornness to hold it fast in spite of himself ; for is it not pleasant to see him so eager to prove the power of Ordination in Presbyters till the Council of *Ancyra* ? When his leading assertion all along is, that indeed it was in them at the beginning, but was taken away before the middle of the second Century. What work is here, they lost it in the second Century, and yet retain'd in the fourth, till it was first taken away by the Council of *Ancyra*. Both Propositions are enormously false, and yet both contradictory, so unhappy was this proud man, that he would always contradict himself to be in the wrong. Now this little mutilation of one word, as *π west-terly*, suppos'd, as it reconciles the Canon to the Custom of that Age, so does it to all the other Ancient Canons that were about these Country Bishops, that they had an Episcopal Authority, but so as to be subordinate to the City Bishop, who might

might restrain or extend the exercise of it, as he judged most convenient ; and so by this means they thought that they at once made provision for the Government of those parts that were more remote from the City Bishop's inspection, and withal preserv'd the Ancient Constitution of the Church, of one Sovereign Bishop in a Diocess. And that these *Chorepiscopi* had the Character of proper Bishops appears plainly from the Tenth Canon of the Synod of *Antioch*, that allows them to Ordain the inferiour Officers of the Church, Readers, Sub-Deacons, and Exorcists, but not Priests and Deacons without the Bishop's consent ; and that, saith the Council, *εἰ καὶ Χορεπίσκοποι εἴεν Ἐπισκοπῶν εὐληφότες*, notwithstanding his having had Episcopal Ordination, or as *Rabanus Maurus* Translates it in his little Tract *De Chorepiscopis* at the End of *Petrus de Marcas* Fourth Book, *de Concordiâ : Quamvis manus impositionem Episcoporum perceperint, & ut Episcopi consecrati sint.* And that it is to be understood not of his being Ordain'd by a Bishop, but Ordain'd a Bishop, is evident from the words themselves, for it had been ridiculous to say that a Presbyter shall not Ordain though he be a Presbyter ; so that its meaning can be no other than this, That notwithstanding Country Bishops

Bishops had Episcopal Consecration, yet they were to be limited in the exercise of it by the City Bishop. And therefore in the 57 Canon of *Laodicea* it is Decreed, That no more Country Bishops for the time to come be Ordain'd, but that in their stead *Περιοδευται* or Visitors be appointed. And these were meer Presbyters delegated by the Bishop to visit his Country Churches, and therefore are reckon'd as a distinct Order of men from the *Chorepiscopi* in the Civil^o Law; and this was probably at first thought upon to prevent the danger of Schism, that might, and sometimes did arise from the Country Bishops going beyond their Commission: which if they did, they might the better justify it by their Episcopal Character, and that these Visitors could not so much as pretend to, because they were meer Presbyters, and so not capable of conveying Holy Orders. But these were most of them Topical Councils, and concern'd only particular Provinces; and therefore we find the Church afterwards variously govern'd, in some places by Country Bishops, in others by visiting Presbyters. And yet this is made an Argument by some Learned Men, that the *Chorepiscopi* were no more than Presbyters, because the *Περιοδευται* that were meer

*Just. s. 9.
l. 4. c. de
Epis. & cl.*

meer Presbyters, were qualified to succeed in, and supply their Office. But besides that they were distinguished in Ancient Writers; if they were the same, to what purpose was one abrogated, and the other instituted in its stead? so that the meer Succession of the one to the other, is an undeniable note of their distinction. Especially when this Canon of *Laodicea* was made in pursuance of the *Sardican* Canon, that forbids the erecting Episcopal Sees in Country Villages or small Cities, and therefore to avoid that inconvenience, this Canon of *Laodicea* supplies their place by visiting Presbyters. But there are two Arguments that have enclined the two great Arch-bishops of *Spalato* and *Paris* to conclude them Presbyters. First, That the Synod of *Neocaesarea* says, that they were appointed in imitation of the 70, who were a distinct Order from the Apostles to whom Bishops succeed. It doth so, and perhaps may be mistaken in its Argument, but though it useth a wrong Topick, yet that does not at all prove that they thought the *Chorepiscopi* no more than the 70, especially when the comparison is so loose, for they affirm not that they succeeded the 70, but only as the 70 were instituted to be assistants to the Apostles, so were these

Chore-

De Rep. Eccl.
clif. l. 2.

e. 9. N. 17.

De Concord.
l. c. 2. 13, 14

Chorepiscopi to their Bishops. And that this very Council esteem'd them proper Bishops is evident from their Eighth Canon, that allows them, but not Presbyters to grant Letters dimissory; and the truth is, that Power was never permitted to any but Bishops. But, say they, in the next place the Canon of *Antioch* commands that every *Chorepiscopus* be Ordained by his own Bishop, whereas it is well known that the Canon of *Nice*, and all the Ancient Canons strictly require that every Bishop be Consecrated by at least three Bishops. But why may not those Canons be fairly understood of City Bishops, for whom the Ordainers were accountable to the whole Province, but a Country Bishop is only for the Use and Service of his own Diocesan, and therefore may as safely be Ordain'd by him alone, as his own Presbyters. Though the true meaning of the Canon is this, not that his own Bishop is sufficient to his Consecration, but that he is necessary, so that he ought not to be Consecrated without him; as no Bishop of the Province may without the Metropolitan, not that the Metropolitan can do it alone, but that he must be one of the Ordainers. But the Canon of *Antioch* is so expresse for the Episcopal Consecration of the *Chorepiscopi*,

De cler.

b. l. c. 17.

episcopi, that the Learned Arch-bishop of *Paris* hath no other way to avoid it, but by distinguishing, as *Bellarmino* had done before him, the Office from the Person, that might sometime be a Bishop, and sometime a Presbyter, and that he saith is the meaning of those words, although he have receiv'd Episcopal Ordination; that is, though the *Chorepiscopus* be a Bishop himself, and not as sometime he may be, a meer Presbyter. But this is precariously said without any shadow of Pretence for it, but meerly to save his own Hypothesis. But that they could be nothing less than true and proper Bishops, cannot but be evident to a man of his learning from their intrinsic power of Ordination, that is suppos'd in them by this and all the other Canons, but onely limited and restrained to a subordination to their chief Bishop. But whatever they were they continued some Ages in the Christian Church, but not without great bickerings, being sometime put down, and sometime getting up again, according to the temper of the Diocesan Bishops, till the time of *Charles* the Great, when though they were not utterly laid aside, yet they had their last and fatal Sentence.

For their Cause being then hotly agitated in *France* and *Germany*, as appears not
only

only from the Capitulars, but from *Hincmarus* and *Rabanus Maurus*, who tho' both honest men, were of different Factions in this Contest. *Rabanus Maurus* pleads the cause of the *Chorepiscopi* against the Pride of the City Bishops, who would endure no Partisans in their Authority; and therefore he imputes their Zeal against the Countrey Bishops to their own designs of Ambition. *Hincmarus* on the contrary objects it to the Bishops that appeared for them, that it was for their own Ease and Laziness, that they desir'd their Continuance, that whilst their Deputies undertook the Care of the Diocess, they might give themselves up to their own Pleasures. The Arguments on both sides were but Popular, and indeed Personal, and might both be true or both false: But the Emperor it seems approving the Reasons against them, as appears by his Capitulars, refers the matter to Pope *Damasus*, who immediately Condemns the whole Order, and Abrogates them for ever, as a sort of Amphibious Creatures between Bishops and Presbyters, that had no Foundation from any Divine Authority. *Nam non amplius quam duos Ordines inter Discipulos Domini cognovimus, i. e. duodecim Apostolorum & 70. Discipulorum, Unde iste tertius processerit funditus Ignoramus; Et quod*

* *ratione*

*Distinc 68.
cap. 5.*

*Separation
of Churches
Cap. 23.*

ratione caret extirpari necesse est. And the same was decreed by several Councils, but yet for all that they struggl'd for a long time after, and were not totally abrogated, as *Petrus de Marca* observes out of *Sigebert*, till the end of the eleventh Century. Though this at last prov'd the overthrow of the Power of the Bishops themselves, for whilst they, to be rid of their Competitors, degraded those who had exercised all the Parts of the Episcopal Office to the Order of Presbyters, the Pope and his Parasites, as Mr. *Dodwell* hath very acutely observ'd, take Advantage of it to depress the Episcopal Office it self, making it of the same Order with the Priestly, and differing only in Degree, which might be given, as it had been before to the *Chorepiscopi*, to simple Presbyters by Papal Delegations, and by this Artifice he rais'd himself to his absolute Sovereignty over all Bishops and Councils, in that he effected what he pleas'd every where by his own immediate Delegates, the Bishops not being able to withstand the greatness of his Power. But of the Steps of the Papal Ambition I shall discourse afterwards, though from this slish Accident it may appear how they ever sat at Watch to make their Advantage of every thing that happen'd in the *Christian Church*.

§. XII. The next great division of Government above that of a City, and it's Territories in the *Roman Empire* was into Provinces, which comprehended several Cities within the circuit of their Jurisdiction. These were at first nothing else, but the Nations that were conquer'd by the *Roman People*. *Provinciae appellantur* (says *Festus*) *quod populus Romanus eas provicit, i. e. ante vicit.* But when the *Commonwealth* came to it's greatness, it's Government was divided into several parcels or Provinces, which the great Men shar'd among themselves, either by Lot, or Vote, or Office. And when that was afterward turn'd into a *Monarchy* under *Augustus*, he took an Account of the whole Empire, and new settled it's Government, as he judg'd most expedient to the Interest of the State; Of all which himself compos'd a little Book call'd the *Breviary of the Empire*, which he offer'd to deliver up to the Senate in his mock-Complement, when he pretended to resign up the Imperial Power into their hands, but left it as a Legacy to his Successors for their Guide in the Government of their Empire. And this was the standing Model of the State with some Alterations that were afterwards made by several Emperours, especially

ally *Adrian*, as to the Bounds of Jurisdiction, but without any change of the form of *Provincial Government*. Now in these Provinces the head City, in which the *Roman* Governors resided, and kept their Courts of Judicature was call'd the *Metropolis*; whither Men resorted out of the lesser Cities for appeals of Justice, as they did to them out of the adjacent Countrey for the Tryal of original Causes. And the Governor that kept his Residence there, had a Supreme Authority over the Magistrates of the inferior Cities, so as that they were Accountable to him for the execution of their Office, and oblig'd to attend his Summons to Provincial Assemblies, in which he presided to propose matters of Debate, to declare the results of Council, and to determine the last Resolution of things; for without him nothing could be concluded or Executed. Now in conformity to this civil mold of the Empire, the Constitution of the Church was cast, that as Bishopricks were erected in Cities, so were Metropolitans in Provinces, who presided over the Bishops of inferior Cities, as the Provincial Governors did over the City Magistrates. And thereby they not only settled the most expedit correspondence with the civil Government, but by making the
head

head City of every Province the Metropolis of the Church within that Province, upon which the Inferior Cities depended as the Centre of Communion, they admirably secur'd the unity of the whole Body, whilst every Episcopal Church exercised ordinary Jurisdiction within it self; but was bound in cases of great difficulty, or such as concern'd the common Christianity, or the peace of the particular Province, or upon any Summons from the Metropolitan to have recourse to the Mother Church, where the Bishop of it presided in a Synod of the Bishops of the Province, by whom all the Affairs of the Church within the Province were Govern'd. Into this frame of Government did Christianity work and settle it self as it prevail'd in the World; and we find the Institution of Metropolitans so antient, that we can discover no beginning of them, unless we derive them from the Apostles own times. But here learned Men run themselves into a great Variety of Disputes: Whether Metropolitical Government were instituted by the Apostles, or whether it came in of its own accord? And if instituted by the Apostles, whether they did it by Divine direction or upon humane prudence? And whether several Cities mention'd in the Scriptures,

particularly the seven Churches of *Asia*, were true and proper Metropoles? But as those things have not sufficient certainty in themselves, so are they of no great weight to the Cause of Metropolitans: for which soever proves true, it proves both their prime Antiquity and great usefulness. If they were instituted by the Apostles, then it is plain that they thought this form of Government most proper and suitable to the State of the Christian Church. And if in it they were directed immediately by the Holy Ghost, that gives them Divine Authority: If they were guided to it by their own Wisdom, then it is a gross folly to forsake an Establishment that was contriv'd, and settled by the Wisdom of the Apostles. But to divide between the Divine Guidance and humane Wisdom in their Actions is a very Phantastick Curiosity; for whatever the Spirit of God directed them to, it was agreeable to the Rules of humane Prudence, otherwise to be sure it would never have directed them to it, and what ever they did according to the Rules of humane Prudence, it was no doubt agreeable to the mind of God, otherwise he would never have suffer'd them to do it and settle it for ever. So that their Practice in every thing, that is of moment enough to be
ob-

observ'd, is warrantable both ways, by Divine approbation, and the Wisdom of the thing it self. And the same is the case, if it came not in by any Apostolical design, but by vertue of its own Expediency, for then it warrants it self by the great reasonableness and necessity of the thing. So that upon whatever account it came in, it is sufficiently recommended to our imitation, in that it was found so expedient for the right Administration of the Church, that it was both practis'd from the beginning, and continued unalter'd in all the purer Ages of the Church. And tho' there is no certainty of its Apostolical Practice as to all places, yet there is as to several, and of their Design as to all. There are so many intimations of it, in the Apostles writings, agreeable to the Practice of the Primitive Church, as certainly prove that the practice of it came down from their prescription. Thus *St. Peter* directs his Epistle to the several Churches of the Christian *Jews*, with respect to so many several Provinces, *Pontus, Galatia, Cappadocia, Asia, and Bithynia*, which as they were distinct Provinces in the Civil division of the Empire, so were they ever so many distinct Provincial Sees in the Communion of the Church, and nothing is more obvious in the Epistles of

2 Cor. c. i.
 To the
 Church of
 God which
 is at Co-
 rinth, with
 all the
 Saints that
 are in all
 A'chala.
 Corinth
 was the
 Metropolis
 of Achala.
 Florus l.
 2. Cap. 16.
 Acts 15. 23.

Epist. ad
 Roman.

St. Paul, than the direction of his Letters to the Metropolitan Church, to be communicated to the whole Province. The same thing that is sufficiently intimated in their practice, as in that known case of the Apostles making a Decree for *Antioch*, by which all the Churches of *Syria* were concluded; *Antioch* being their Metropolitan See, and as it happen'd *Cilicia* too. That it was a civil Metropolis is out of question, and that it was so upon an Ecclesiastical score very early, is evident from *Ignatius*, who because he was Bishop of *Antioch*, styles himself Bishop of *Syria*, the Province, of which *Antioch* was the Metropolis. And therefore it is but reasonable to think that the Apostles looked upon the Church of *Antioch*, as comprehending the whole Province of *Syria*. But to this it is reply'd: *In good earnest, doth the Church of Syria and Cilicia, (being bound by this decree) prove their Subordination to Antioch or the Apostles? Why in good earnest (for jesting in these matters is not to be endur'd) I think it proves both; the Churches of Syria were bound by the Apostles decree that was made for Antioch, because they were under its Jurisdiction, and the Church of the Province of Cilicia by reason of their Neighbourhood and equal concernment in*
 the

the same Controversie. But it is still objected that they delivered the Decree to the Churches of *Phrygia* and *Galatia*. Yes so they did, not as to Subject but Sister Churches, and upon the same Account that they did it to the Churches of *Cilicia*, because those four Provinces seem to have been particularly infested at that time with that Controversie. But still we are ask'd: (with trifling enough) *What do the Decrees of the Apostles concern, only those, to whom they are inscrib'd?* Whoever said they did or did not, how does it follow from hence that because all the Churches of a Province are particularly concern'd in a Decree, directed to their Metropolis, therefore none other are? but because the question is ask'd, though how pertinently I cannot understand, yet because it is demanded in another case not altogether beside the purpose; I shall once for all answer it. That I cannot find but as this Decree was temporary, so was it local, made for some particular Churches, who then stood in need of it, and not Universal, so as to oblige all Churches to its observation. Otherwise how could there have been that controversie in the Church of *Corinth*, about things offer'd to Idols, if this Decree had ever been in force there; or at least how should *St. Paul* have advis'd

the *Corinthians* to eat them as Gods Creatures, but not as things offer'd to Idols, as he doth the 1st. to the *Corinth.* 8. 7. when the whole Body of the Apostles had by this Decree so absolutely forbidden the eating of them at all.

But to proceed, it is sufficiently known that *Ephesus* was the Metropolis of the Proconsular *Asia*, and therefore it was that St. *Paul* summon'd the Governours of that Church to him at *Miletus* as the head Church, and by consequence the Representatives of all the Churches of that Province. And so was *Corinth* the known Metropolis of *Achaia*, and for that reason St. *Paul* inscrib'd his Epistle to the *Corinthians*, so as to take in all the Christians of *Achaia*. And so was *Thessalonica* of *Macedonia*, for which reason St. *Paul* in his Epistles to them bespeaks all the Christians of the Province of *Macedonia*. But though many and indeed most of the Churches, to whom the Apostles directed their Epistles, were Metropolitica, yet I cannot see what ground there is to conclude that they were all such. I will not determine whether *Philippi* were a Metropolis, or all the seven Churches of *Asia*; *Philadelphia* and *Thiatyra* for any thing I know might be but Bishopricks, under the Metropolis of *Sardis* and *Perga-*

mus, And I pray why might not the Apostles write either to Bishops or Metropolitans, as they had occasion, or as circumstances determin'd them? So though the City of *Colossæ* were no Metropolis but an eminent City in the Province of *Lydia*, under the Metropolis of *Laodicea*; yet because St. *Paul* had been very successful there in his Ministry, and that not only in the great Numbers of his Converts, but in their extraordinary Zeal for the Christian Faith, which he so highly commends in them in the beginning of his Epistle, for that reason he might direct his Letter to them, though with particular order to have it Communicated to the *Laodiceans*. So that though *Laodicea* were the chief City in Dignity, yet *Colossæ* being then the most eminent Church, what wonder is it if the Apostle shewed it the more particular respect? But that there was a dependence of these Churches upon one another, appears from St. *Paul's* order to have his Epistle to the *Colossians* communicated to the Church of *Laodicea*; and his Epistle to the *Laodiceans* (which the Learned say, from the Authority of *Tertullian* and *Epiphanius*, was the same with that he sent to the *Ephesians*) communicated to the Church of *Colossæ*, being both of the same Province.

Though

Ch. 4. 13.
15. 16.

Though otherwise the Apostle generally directed his Epistles either to the Church of the whole Province, as to the *Romans* and *Galatians*: or to the Metropolis of the Province, as *Corinth*, *Ephesus* and *Thessalonica*: or to the Metropolitan himself, as *Timothy* and *Titus*. In short, though this were their ordinary Rule, by which they settled Churches, yet it is probable that they might sometimes vary from it in extraordinary Cases, and for particular reasons, of which we can have no knowledge or certainty. Though indeed the most insuperable difficulty is, that we have none of the more Ancient Accounts of the State of the Empire, and all that we know of it is by meer fragments and casual passages. *Strabo* and *Pliny* have left a pretty good account of its Geography, but have given very slight touches upon its Political Government. And whereas *Strabo* hath in the conclusion of his work drawn up a general Description of the Present State of the Empire under *Augustus*, if he had descended to a particular Account of all the Provinces and Limits of Government, we should have had a much better insight into the state of things at that time, then we are ever likely to retrieve. However it is enough that there were Metropoles in the Apostles time,

that

that themselves had special regard to their Preheminence, both in their Writings and Actions, and that the first Churches that we meet with next after their times were settled in the same form : So that as this design of Conforming the Ecclesiastical state to the Civil, was first set on foot by the Apostles, so was it carefully prosecuted by their immediate Successors, and by them delivered from the Apostles down to After-ages. For this was apparently the Constitution of the Christian Church in all places of the Empire for the first three hundred years, or the whole Interval of time from our Saviour to *Constantine*, that as every City was govern'd by its own Bishop with his Consistory of Presbyters, so was every Province by its own Metropolitan with his Synod of Bishops.

§. XIII. Of this there are numberless instances in the Records of the Church, and the truth of it is, we have the same Proof of their Preheminence over Bishops from the time of the Apostles, as we have of the Superiority of Bishops over Presbyters ; nay the clearest proof of this depends not a little upon that, because we have no perfect List of the Succession of the Bishops of any See, but such as were
Metropo-

Metropolitans, who were therefore most taken notice of, because of their Supreme Eminence in the Christian Church. Thus the Catalogues of the Bishops of *Rome*, *Alexandria*, *Antioch* and *Jerusalem* were preserved entire, whereas the memory of the Bishops of any other inferiour Sees is for the most part personal, and depends upon the worth of the man, either for his Learning or his Zeal, or his Suffering. Though whilst the Records of those four Great and Ancient Sees were carefully preserved, they contain the main History and chief Transactions of the Christian Church. And as we find Metropolitans in possession from the Apostles, and their immediate Successours; so we find no alteration till the time of *Constantine*, of which afterwards. At the present it is clear that Metropolitans were not instituted by any Council for the first 300 years, and that too is a proof of their Apostolical Descent. For what we find always practis'd, and find no later beginning of its practice, must be refer'd to the first beginning of all. The most Ancient Canons that we have are the Apostolical, which though they were not compil'd by the Apostles themselves, yet they were by Apostolical men, and such as immediatly succeeded them, and that too from the
most

most antient traditions of the Church, so that they were not so much new Laws as Ratifications of the old Customs. Now in this Collection it is requir'd in the 34th. Canon, *That the Bishops of every Nation acknowledge their Primate or first Bishop, and honour him as their head, and do nothing of moment without his Consent, nor he without theirs.* Which Canon doth not appoint the Primate, but supposes him already known in every place, and only commands the Bishops to behave themselves with that Duty and Reverence towards him, that they were bound to pay to their head Bishop. So that the very making of this Canon, supposes him already known, for otherwise it had been very absur'd to command all Bishops to reverence their Primate; if there had been no such thing known in the World as a Primate. But though there are numberless Instances of this Practice in the Records of the Church; yet one of the earliest and most eminent of all appears in those several Synods, that were call'd about the *Paschal Controversie*, in the very next Century to that of the Apostles; which as it was canvass'd all the world over, so was it debated in so many several Provincial Synods, in each whereof the Head Bishop or Metropolitan presided. In *Palestine*
Theo.

Theophilus of *Cæsarea*, and *Narcissus* of *Jerusalem*; for after the destruction of *Jerusalem*, *Cæsarea* was made the Civil Metropolis of *Judea*; but because *Jerusalem* had once been Metropolis (not only of *Palestine*, but of the whole *Christian Church*) it was ever after allow'd the honour and dignity of a Metropolitan, reserving the Power to *Cæsarea*, which was confirm'd by the Synod of *Nice*, as an ancient Custom. And that's the Reason why *Narcissus* of *Jerusalem*, is here joyn'd to *Theophilus* of *Cæsarea*. But as for the other Councils, the Metropolitan alone is named, as *Victor* at *Rome*, *Jrenæus* in *France*, and *Palmas* Bishop of *Amastris* in *Pontus*; but because *Heraclea* and not *Amastris*, was the Metropolis of that Province; *Eusebius* adds the particular reason of his presiding in that Council, *ὡς ἀρχαιώτατος* because of his Age and Seniority. *Heraclea* might at that time be destitute of a Bishop, or the Bishop not be able to attend in Person, and therefore old *Palmas* was, (according to the Custom of those times) chosen out of reverence to his Age. But as for all the other Metropolitans presiding, *Eusebius* gives no Reason, because they did it by virtue of their Office. Besides these there was another Council in the Province of *Osdrona*.

ena, of which *Edessa* was Metropolis, but who was President in it is not recorded. Only this reflects some little Evidence upon the History of *Agbarus*, and the early Plantation of *Christianity* in those remote Parts, when we find a Church form'd, and settled there with the first of the most antient Churches; so that in all the Records of the Church downward we still find this one of the most forward and flourishing Churches in the World. And thus in the time of the Council of *Calcedon*, there were above two hundred Clergy appertaining to that City alone. In the Synod of the *Proconsular Asia*, *Policrates*, Bishop of *Ephesus* presided, who says he had under him *πολλὰ πλῆθῃ* a great multitude of Bishops; the *Notitiæ* reckon up no less then 37. These he summon'd to Council at *Victors* request. He had Power then to Summon them, else *Victor* could never have ask'd it, nor he have done it. And the same was the Constitution of the Churches in *Africa*. *St. Cyprian* says, he had in his Province *Afric* strictly so call'd, *Numidia*, and both the *Mauritania's*; And mentions in his Epistle to *Jubianus*, one of his Predecessors, *Agrippinus* that summon'd a Council of a great many Bishops, and yet he himself was Bishop, before the middle of the second Century after the

Apostles, and summon'd a Council at *Carthage*, in the fifty eighth year of that Century. And therefore those *multi anni* and that *longa ætas*, that he speaks of before his time, when *Agrippinus* call'd his Council, in which were very many Bishops, could not be many years after the Apostles. So evident is this Apostolical, either Institution or practice of Metropolitans, in the most antient Records of the Church, that it must be a strange kind of willful obstinacy that will not perceive it. And it becomes only *Salmasius* his confidence to deny it, who is very earnest in it, that Metropolitans of old had only a Primacy of Honour, but nothing of peculiar Jurisdiction; and this he thinks is sufficiently prov'd from the Reason that the Council of *Antioch* assigns for their Institution, *viz.* That because of the great Concourse of People to the Metropolis, it was but fit to give the *Honour* of presiding over the whole Province to the Bishop of that City. As if the very name of Honour excluded all Power, or as if Power were not the greatest Honour. But doth not the Council give the same Power to Metropolitans within their Province, that is given to Bishops within their Diocess, which is in expresse terms, that nothing be done without them or their consent,

*De prim.
Pap. c. 3.*

sent. Now if this Power be no Power because it is an Honour, then I confess *Salmasius* is a *Logician*. But when he describes the several parts of this Honour that he would have to be without Authority he very much exceeds himself; for he places it only in these four trifles: First a Power of allowing or refusing the Ordination of Bishops: Secondly of Summoning Councils: Thirdly of receiving Appeals: Fourthly of censuring Bishops themselves as they do their inferior Clergy, all which saith the *Grammarians*, being rather *Onus* than *Honos*, he conceives to have in it no Supremacy of Power. See what Pride and Prejudice will bring men to: But he is a man so fatally injudicious, that if ever he happen to stumble upon the Right, it always happens to be in the pursuit of a wrong Cause, and whenever he had a Right one, he was always sure to loose or leave it by pursuing it the wrong way. And thus his Zeal (through out this Voluminous Book) against *Popery*, is spent meerly in the Cause of Presbytery, as he tells us in his Preface, that there can be no reconciliation between *Papists* and *Protestants*, because *Popery* is founded upon the Supposition of the Divine Right of Episcopacy, and this he saith was the design of writing his Book, in answer to a-

N

nother

Cap. 4.
Primatus
autem eorum
privilegium in his
sermone quatuor
positum diximus
fuisse, in Episcoporum
ordinandorum
confirmatione,
conciliorum
indictione,
appellationibus,
ac censurâ
morum, &c.

nother that was written to perswade a Reconciliation, which upon this Account he shews to be Impossible. And so here when he is to prove that there was no Power Superior to Metropolitans, he goes about to do it by endeavouring to shew that there was no Metropolitan Power at all, which beside its apparent falshood, destroys the very being of the Question. But there is one thing peculiar in the Power of Metropolitans, that perhaps was too nice and subtile for his *Grammatical* head to comprehend, and that is, that it was not a single or a personal Power residing in himself alone, but in conjunction with his Provincial Synod. For without them he had no Authority but in his own Diocess, so that *Salmasius*, (who stumbles every step he takes) gives him too much, when he allows him as Metropolitan, the power of receiving Appeals, and censuring other Bishops, whereas it was never heard of in the *Primitive* Church, that any Metropolitan should take an Appeal from, or pass Sentence upon another Bishop by his own single Authority: Such things were transacted no where but in the Provincial Synod; and if the Metropolitan had presum'd to attempt any such thing without them, the Canons of the Church depos'd him for his Presumption upon the

Rights

Rights of the Episcopal Colledge. But though he had no single Authority as Metropolitan ; yet the Authority he had in conjunction with his Synod was Superior to that of any other single Bishop ; and therefore was not a meer Honorary Dignity, but an effectual Power , for the Power of Summoning Councils, and presiding in them, is an high Degree of Authority, his casting Voice in all Debates is still an higher , but whether he had a negative Voice I cannot possibly determine ; for though the Canons sometimes seem to give it him, yet they seem more expressly to restrain him from it , and the allowed practice of the Church doth frequently contradict it. *Γνώμη* is the word by which it is expressed in the Antient Canons, but its certain signification is not agreed on among learned men, and it may signify either consent, or only Advice or Consultation : Thus whereas in the 34th. Apostolical Canon it is commanded , that the Bishops of the Province do nothing *ἀνεὺ τῆς γνώμης τῆς μητροπολίτε* , so in the same Canon is it enjoyn'd the Metropolitan, that he do nothing too, *ἀνεὺ τῆς πάντων γνώμης* , now if *γνώμη* signify consent, then no business can be done unless all the Bishops of the Province agree in Opinion, and if one dissent, it shall hinder all Pro-

ceedings, which is too absur'd to be here supposed; for instead of securing the Government of the Church, it utterly confounds it; for it ought not to be expected that a Multitude of Men of equal Power should agree in any one Act of Prudence, and such are most Acts of Discipline, and therefore in such a constitution the standing rule is that the Votes of the greater number conclude the Rest. And so it must be in this Canon, for otherwise if it allow the Metropolitan, a negative Vote, it must allow the same to every Bishop, because the *γνώμη* of all is as much requir'd as his own, so that the plain meaning of it can be nothing else than this, that all affairs of weight and moment, ought to be debated and determined in a free Council of the Metropolitan and his Bishops; so that no Council ought to be conven'd without his knowledge and approbation; and that to every Council he ought to Summon every Bishop. This Canon we find frequently repeated in following Synods in the same words, and therefore in the same sense, only there is something peculiar suggested in the Famous sixth Canon of *Nice*, where after it hath made a peremptory Decree, That no Bishop be Ordain'd without the *γνώμη* of the Metropolitan; It immediately adds, but

but if any one be duly and canonically Elected by a common Suffrage, tho' two or three dissent for love of Contradiction, yet the Major vote carries it. And this being set down without Exception, if the Metropolitan himself (without whose knowledge nothing is to be done) be one of the peevish Dissenters ; the sense of the body of the Council is by this Rule to prevail. And if it were not so , there would have been then no Jurisdiction in the Church to reach the miscarriages of Metropolitans, because at that time there was no higher standing Authority, than the Provincial Synod ; and if he was not lyable to their Censure , He must be exempt from all Ecclesiastical Judgement ; a thing contrary to the sence and practice of the whole Church, and never challeng'd but by the *Popes* , when they had swallow'd up all the Jurisdiction of the Church into St. *Peter* and themselves. However no Bishop ever challeng'd Power of Appeals from or censure against another Bishop, by his own single Authority , till the Bishops of *Rome* set their Legates upon so daring a presumption ; so that how high soever the dignity and Power of Metropolitans might be, yet whilst it could only exert it self in Synod , as it was a necessary preservative of Order and good

Government, so was it as much as is possible, curb'd from swelling into Tyranny. And this is the ground of that excellent saying of St. Cyprian in his *Carthaginian Synod*: *Neque enim quisquam nostrum Episcopum se esse Episcoporum constituit, aut Tyrannico terrore ad obsequendi necessitatem Collegas suos adigit, quando habeat omnis Episcopus pro licentiâ libertatis & potestatis suæ arbitrium proprium, tanquam judicari ab alio non possit, cum nec ipse possit alterum judicare.* "Let not any of us make himself
 "a Bishop of Bishops, or force his Colle-
 "gues by Tyrannous threatnings to a necessi-
 "ty of Obedience, when every Bishop hath a
 "Freedom and Power of his own Actions,
 "neither subject to the Judgement of ano-
 "ther, nor to be the Judge of another. From
 whence *Salmasius* will infer, That in St. Cyprians time there were no Metropolitans, as if a Metropolitan were equivalent with a Bishop of Bishops, which is a gross defiance to St. Cyprians own meaning; for in these words he exhorts the Bishops to freedom of Speech in Council, as Equals and Collegues in *Synodical* Authority; and though it is evident that he was their Metropolitan by his Summoning the Council, yet he declares to them, that neither himself nor any man else, hath any Power of over-ruling in it; and that

*De Prim.
 l. 4. p. 56.*

it were Tyranny to pretend to it; and so it were; and Folly too, to Summon Councils, when they were absolutely to be determined by the sense of one Man; So that as St. *Cyprian* always disclaim'd any single Authority, even out of Synod, as in the Case of receiving the *Leepſi* to Communion, he Writes to his Clergy:

Quæ res cum omnium nostrum sententiam & consilium spectet, præjudicare Ego, & solus mihi rem Communem vindicare non audeo,

Lib. 3. Ep.
19. Ed. pam.

&c. "This thing concerns the Judgement of us all, and therefore I dare not pass my single Judgement upon it, and arrogate to my self a Power that lyes in Common. So

now he declares against any such Authority in Synod, for though he were president, he was but part of it, and had only a share of the common Power, according to his standing Maxim, *Episcopatus unus est Episcoporum multorum concordie numerositate diffusus*. But because St. *Cyprian* disowns any single Supremacy in himself as Metropolitan; from thence to infer in good earnest that he was no Metropolitan, is but another Cast of the *Grammarians* Logique; but his fetch to avoid St. *Cyprians* *provincia nostra* is surprizingly subtle, (*viz*) That when St. *Cyprian* says of his Province or *Provincia nostra*, that it was extended over *Numidia*, and both the

Mauritania's, that is as men call their native Country *Patria nostra*, though they do not Govern it. But I pray who Summon'd the Synod to *Carthage*? Did not *Cyprian*? Was he not then Metropolitan, that being the chief branch of Metropolitick jurisdiction. And when he speaks of his own Province; Was not that a distinct Province from others? and does not that alone require a Metropolitan presiding over the Synod of the Bishops of that Province? For a distinct Province makes a distinct Synod, and a Synod there cannot be unless there be some body, who hath power to call it, and preside in it. So that when St. *Cyprian* calls *Numidia* and both the *Mauritania's*, *our Province*, it is the same thing as if a Prince should call his Kingdom our Country; for tho the words themselves do not imply his Sovereignty over it, yet out of his mouth they expressly declare it; So when St. *Cyprian* (who was President of the Synod of his Province) owns his Province, he thereby calls himself its Metropolitan.

But though this man hath scarce one true syllable in all his Writings of the antient State of the Church, yet in the Cause of Metropolitans, he exceeds himself in boldness and self-contradiction. Thus when he hath so peremptorily disclaim'd
all

all Metropolitcal Authority in the Bishop of Carthage or any other; he as frankly restores it all back again: *Facile quidem omnibus earum provinciarum Episcopis Auctoritate antecellebat Episcopus Carthaginensis propter Urbis magnitudinem ac dignitatem, non ita tamen ut cæteris Episcopis pro libito imperaret, aut ullam in eos potestatem sibi arrogaret, aut jurisdictionem exerceret,*

De Prim.
c. 15. p. 239.

“The Bishop of Carthage exceeded all
“the other Bishops of those Provinces in Au-
“thority, by reason of the greatness of his
“City, but so as not to have any Arbitrary
“Power; or to assume to himself Sovereign
“Jurisdiction over them. Here the Case is
fairly stated, he had more Authority than
other Bishops, and yet himself alone had
not, and the reason of it that he Assigns
is very clear. *Nihil enim illis facere, aut
decernere licitum erat, absque Episcoporum
provincialium Auctoritate ac sententia.*” Be-
“cause it is not lawful for Metropolitans to
“do or to determine any thing without the
“Judgement and Authority of the Provinci-
“al Bishops. Then a Metropolitan it
seems was no Bishop of Bishops, and then
what becomes of all his Puther against
them, from St. Cyprians disowning any
such Authority in himself, because it was
of no force, but in conjunction with his
pro-

provincial Synod ; and yet this very man hath the Confidence a few Pages after to tell us that the Metropolitcal Power as such, was nothing else but the Usurpation of one single Bishop over his Brethren. *Quod mutatum est invec̃la Metropolitanorum potestate, quā unus pluribus impositus est Episcopis, ad eos Judicandos & ad obsequendi etiam necessitatem adigendos, qui Metropolitanus revera Episcopus Episcoporum totius alicujus Provinciæ cui præsidet dici potest.* Discoursing of the Equality of Bishops he says, *That was destroyed when the Power of Metropolitans was brought in: by which one Bishop was set over others to Govern them, and compel them to obedience; such a Metropolitan is indeed a Bishop of Bishops over his whole Province.* What staring is here against undeniable Truth? He will allow no Metropolitans because the Cause of Presbytery requires it, and yet because it cannot be deny'd that there were Metropolitans, he gives us his own Arbitrary Definition of them, that as such they were Tyrants and Usurpers. What when we are just now told that they had a regular Authority, that was confin'd to the Synod of the Province? This I call staring, when a man is forc'd by the Evidence of a Thing to confess it,; yet because his Cause requires it, will confidently

dently deny it. But the noblest Case of his Confidence is his Introduction to his Discourse against Metropolitans, for being resolv'd to prove that there never was, nor ever ought to be any such thing, he begins this great Undertaking with a Proof of their absolute Necessity to the Peace and Government of the Church. This is hardly credible, and yet it is one of the clearest and most pregnant passages in the whole Book: Having stated the Equality of Bishops, he thus proceeds, *Hitherto all things are clear, no man is to exceed his bounds, or invade anothers Jurisdiction; but what is to be done if any thing of common Concernment happen, any thing that relates to the benefit of the whole Province; what if a Bishop accuses his Presbyter, or himself be accused by his Clergy? Who shall be Judge, or before whom shall the Guilty party be presented? You will say by all the Bishops of the Province. Very good and true! But I pray who shall Summon them? to whom will you give this Power? If all challenge it, that can breed nothing but discord and contention. The only remedy found against such Inconveniences is that by the consent of all, the Primacy should be Deposited with the Bishop of the Metropolis or Head City of the Province, to provide for such cases as concern all in Common.* Excellently well argued, for a man that
is

is Summoning all his Forces, to prove that there were no Metropolitans, (*viz.*) because Metropolitans there must be. But this I hope is enough, I doubt too much to shew the vanity of this learned mans attempt upon this argument, at least it may suffice to state the just Authority of Metropolitans between the two extreams of making it a meer titular dignity on one hand, or an uncontrollable Monarchy on the other, by assigning it a proper superiority, but so as to be exerted only in Council. This that I have hitherto described was the true *Primitive* and *Apostolical Constitution* of the *Christian Church*, which lasted the same without any material Alteration, till the time of *Constantine the Great*.

§. XIV. But now behold new *Heavens* and a new *Earth*, the whole World is molded as it were into another Creation, and not only the Religion, but the Civil Government of that vast Empire is wrought into a new frame, and settled upon new Foundations by this mighty Prince. It had (it seems) been the Custome of the greatest Emperors, and such as were most ambitious of leaving Monuments of their Wisdom and Ability, to contrive new Models and Platforms for the Government of the Empire; whereby they shew'd how
well

well they understood the Interests of State and the Advantages of Government. This was done by *Augustus*, by *Adrian*, by *Vespasian*; But *Constantine* endeavouring to out-do them all, was not content as his Predecessors were to make considerable Alterations in several parts of the Empire; and therefore casts the whole into a new Model of Government. All Offices Civil, Military, Courtly were of a new Institution, in-so-much that he almost made a new Language in the *Roman* Empire. And perhaps this new form of Government that he erected, was not so much the effect of his Ambition as his Wisdom. For as for the *Præfecti Prætorio* the Generalls of the *Prætorian Bands* which were instituted by *Augustus*; it was evident from long Experience that their Power was too great for the Safety of the Empire; so that they might (as they had often done) make themselves Emperours when they pleas'd. And though *Augustus* appointed two, that they might give Check to each others Ambition; yet for all that he made himself but one of the *Triumvirate*, and if they fell out, he stood not upon much better terms with the Conqueror than he did with *Mark Antony*, when they had cashier'd *Lepidus*. It was a great Authority that such a Commander

mander must have to be the Darling of
 ten thousand of the choicest Souldiers of
 the Empire, who indeed Commanded all
 the Rest; So that to seduce them from
 their Allegiance, was to carry off the
 whole Army; and therefore though *Au-*
gustus found no disturbance from them, by
 reason of his exactness in Government, yet
 his Successors soon felt their Power. *Tibe-*
rius was forc'd to Murder *Sejanus*, whom
 he had made sole *Præfekt*, to secure himself.
 But though this Military Power were of
 it self dangerous enough, yet in process
 of time through the sloath and Luxury of
 some of the Emperours, they got the Su-
 preme Government of all Civil Affairs in-
 to their own hands, and so had the whole
 Power of the Empire entirely at their own
 disposal. And therefore *Constantine* was
 wiser than to trust such an exorbitant
 Power in a Subjects hand; and first di-
 vides the Military Power from the Civil;
 settled the former upon his new Officers
 call'd *Magistri Militum*, divides the latter
 among four, and to humor them allows
 them large Jurisdiction, dividing the
 whole Empire between them: Saving,
That Rome and the Country lying about it
for an Hundred miles was Govern'd by a
Præfekt of its own. Now the Empire be-
 ing thus divided into four districts, under
 these

these four *Præfects*, (*viz.*) The *Præfect* of the *East*, of *Illyricum*, of *Italy* and of *Gaul*; each of them were again subdivided into Subordinate Jurisdictions, call'd *Diocesses*: In all thirteen, each *Diocess* containing many *Provinces*, in all an hundred and twenty, and being govern'd by an Officer of its own call'd *Vicarius*; and as by thus dividing the *Power* of the *Præfects* among so many *Vicarii*, he broke its greatness, so by placing them above the *Provinces* of their *Diocess*, he settled a more exact Correspondence through the Empire. Under the *Præfect* of the *East* were five *Diocesses*; *Ægypt*, the *East* strictly so call'd, *Pontus*, *Asia*, and *Thrace*. The *Diocess* of *Ægypt* containing six *Provinces*, the *East* fifteen, *Asia* ten, *Pontus* ten, and *Thrace* six. Under the *Præfect* of *Illyricum* were two *Diocesses*, *Macedonia* and *Dacia*, *Macedonia* containing six *Provinces*, and *Dacia* five. Under the *Præfect* of *Italy* were three *Diocesses*, *Italy*, *Africk*, and *Illyricum*; *Italy* containing seventeen *Provinces*, *Africk* six, and *Illyricum* six. Under the *Præfect* of *Gaul* were three *Diocesses*, *France*, *Spain* and *Brittain*; *France* containing seventeen *Provinces*, *Spain* seven, *Brittain* five. This is a true and short description of the new State of the Empire, and it is generally supposed by
 Learned

Learned Men to have given Occasion to the Church, to add to the old Ecclesiastical *Hierarchy* of Bishops and Metropolitans, a Superior Order call'd the *Exarch's* of the Diocess, and afterwards *Patriarches*. This I do not question but that they had Power to have done, if they had judg'd it fit: But as to the matter of Fact, if we enquire how and when this new Order came into the Church; we have no footsteps left of their Institution by any Council, no true Record of their first beginning by any Historian; and if we thoroughly examine the Buifiness, we shall find that they thrust themselves upon the Church, and gain'd Authority in it purely by vertue of their own Usurpation. In that when the chief Metropolitan Cities were advanc'd above the other Metropolles, by being made the Seats of the *Vicarii*, or *Lieutenants* of the Diocess, the Metropolitan Bishops of those great Sees, took upon themselves greater State than the ordinary Metropolitans; and though at first they challeng'd and gain'd only the Honour of Precedency, yet that no doubt quickly became a Srirrup to Ambition, to mount into a Superiority of Power and Jurisdiction, as at length they did. But then the Church was all along so far from owning, encouraging or instituting any
Power

Power above Metropolitans, that it did constantly from time to time beat down all the Attempts of any such Ambition. So that all Pretences to any higher Authority have not so much foundation as meer Ecclesiastical Institution, but were brought into the Church by irregular Usurpation, and afterwards receiv'd and confirm'd by sordid flattery. This I know cannot but look like a strange Paradox, for though it hath been much disputed, whether the Patriarchal dignity were founded upon Divine or Ecclesiastical Right, yet no man ever question'd but that they had at least the Rights of Ecclesiastical Institution. But when we come thoroughly to examin the true State of things, we shall find that they were so far from that, that they forc'd their way into the Church, in spite of that great and long opposition that it made against them. And for a clear Demonstration of this, I shall consider all the Laws of the Church that relate to this matter; And first I shall begin with that famous Canon of the great Council of *Nice*, that is thought the very *Magna Charta* of all Patriarchal Jurisdiction: The words of it run thus; *Let antient Customs prevail, let the Churches in Egypt, Lybia, and Pentapolis be subject to the Bishop of Alexandria, as is the Custom*

at Rome, in like manner at Antioch, and the rest of the Provinces; let every Church enjoy its own Priviledges. But this is declared as absolutely certain by the great Synod, That if any man be made a Bishop without the consent of his Metropolitan, he is no Bishop. And if to the legal Election of a Bishop by the Major Vote of the Bishops of the Province, two or three shall oppose themselves, the Vote of the greater Number shall prevail. Here are a great many things confirm'd, all Immemorial customs, but especially the antient bounds of Metropolitcal Jurisdiction, so that the Canon is not to be understood of meer Metropolitcal Power, but all other particular Priviledges, that any Metropolitans enjoy'd by ancient use and Custom; and what they enjoy'd by Custom was meerly accidental to that Power that was properly Metropolitcal and descended from Apostolical Prescription. For though by that every Metropolitan was vested with Supreme Power in his own Province; yet some particular Churches had in process of time gain'd, by use and Custom particular Priviledges, especially the Churches planted in those great Cities, *Rome, Alexandria, and Antioch*; *Rome* the Seat of the Proud Empire; *Alexandria* the head City of *Africk*, and Seat of the great *Ptolomies*; *Antiochia*
Queen

Queen of the *East*, and Seat of the great *Seleucus*, and his Successors: So that having such great Splendor and Authority above all other Cities, that must naturally give them some proportionable Preeminences in the Church, though what they were, or whether any at all does not appear; for the Council mentions no other Privileges, than what relate to the Bounds of Jurisdiction. But though this is apparently all that is express'd by that Canon, yet the greatest part of the Learned men of the Church of *Rome* clearly spy in it, an acknowledgement of the *Popes Supremacy*, by Prescription from the *Apostles*; but with these high-flyers we shall treat apart, and by paralleling their Proofs for their *universal Supremacy* in all Ages, with the certain Records, and undoubted practice of the Church in every Age, make all their Pretences look very ridiculous, for they are no better than gross and perverse Falsifications of, nay ungrounded contradictions to all the Records of the Church. At present I shall treat with men more modest and more moderate, and here the least that most Learned men of all Professions make of this Canon, is the Institution or Ratification of the three great Patriarchates. And this is thought so evident, that the greatest part do not

De Rep. Ec. dispute but suppose it ; even *M. Antonius de Dominis* himself takes it for granted, and he was none of your following Writers, but usually examin'd and consider'd things throughly himself before he determin'd. *Petrus de Marca*, *Carolus St. Paulo* and others think themselves Cocksure of the *Popes Supremacy* over the *Western Churches*, by the unquestionable evidence of it, and till of late it was never so much as controverted. The Learned *La noy* was the first of that Church, that made it a Question in his Treatise *de rectâ interpretatione Canonis Nicæni*; and Dr. *Beveridge* hath been his only second in ours, in his Notes upon the Canon; but the generality of Learned men look upon it as a great Paradox, and particularly the Learned *Valesius* hath oppos'd himself to his Learned Friend *La noy*, with unusual heat and Confidence, boldly challenging him to produce one Author, antient or modern, *Greek* or *Latin*, that ever understood the Canon any other way, than of the Institution or Confirmation of Apostolical Patriarchates. But tho' it is no matter how other men understand the Canon, when it is plain enough to make it self to be rightly understood; yet because *Valesius* is so confident in his Assertion, we will close with him in it, and cast the

the issue of the Debate upon it, and by his own Argument prove that there is no such thing as Patriarchs, or any Superior order to Metropolitans, till many years after the Council of *Nice*. And this will evidently appear if we divide the Records of the Church into two Periods, those that were Written before the Council of *Calcedon*, that first own'd and gave Countenance to this new Order, and those that were Written after it; For as for the Writers after, it must be confess'd that they unanimously agree in the Primitive Antiquity of Patriarchates, which only shews that when one man falls into a mistake, how apt all that follow, are to stumble upon him. For finding this Order in Possession, and no Record of its Institution, it was easie for some careless men, to conclude its being from the Beginning; and this conceit being once started, it was ever after pursued without Examination. But if on the contrary the best Writers before the time of the Council of *Calcedon*, or thereabouts, acknowledged no such Order in the Church; nay if they suppose that there was not, then the case is plain, that there never was any such thing till about that time.

§. XV. And is it not strange, that men so wise and Learned as *Petrus de Marca*,

and *Valesius* should so far Impose upon themselves as seriously to believe that they find the Preeminence of Patriarch's above Metropolitans in this Canon, when it speaks so plainly of only Metropolitical Preeminences, and when it is so Notoriously evident, that there is not the least mention of any such Office in all the Records of the *Christian* Church till near an hundred years after this Council? and yet this *Nicene* Canon only confirms the old and accusom'd Rights of Churches, which could not be Patriarchal, because we can find none such at that time. And the truth is this Canon seems to have been made in pursuance of the 34th. Apostolical Canon, that requires the adherence of all other Inferior Bishops, to the first Bishop of their Nation or Province, and therefore it provides not only for the Priviledges of those three great Sees, but of all other Metropolitans whatsoever; for so the Canon expressly runs, that not only at *Alexandria* and *Antiochia*, as well as *Rome*, but that in all other ἐπαρχίαι or Provinces (for ἐπαρχία is never us'd to signifie any thing else in Church-Writers) their antient Priviledges should be preserv'd. So that indeed this is so far from any Design of erecting Patriarchates, or confirming their Prerogatives, that it supposes no such

such Office in the Church, and declares those three great Cities to be but Metropolitan Churches, because it joyns them with the ἄλλαι ἐπαρχίαι, i. e. The other Provinces, and therefore they themselves could be nothing, but Provincial Churches, as well as these other ἐπαρχίαι with which they were coupl'd. And besides the signification of the words, it is plain from the whole sence and design of the Canon, that it only provides for the Supreme Rights of Metropolitans; for so after its provision for the Rights of particular Churches, it sets down one general Rule, *That nothing be done without the Metropolitan.* That is the whole business of the Council in this Canon, to secure this old Rule that had been of late violated, as will further appear by the Occasion of it, which was this, That *Meletius* Bishop of *Lycopolis* within the Province of *Alexandria* having been depos'd by his Metropolitan in a Synod of Bishops, as for divers other crimes, so particularly for Sacrificing to Idols, he notwithstanding takes upon himself to ordain new Bishops within the Jurisdiction of *Alexandria*, and so violates all the Pre-eminences of his Metropolitan, both by slighting his Censure and invading his Power. Now complaint hereof being brought to the Council, they thereupon

Decree that the Ancient Prerogatives of the Church of *Alexandria* over the Churches that had been of ancient time under its Jurisdiction, should be kept as inviolable as those of *Rome*, so as no ordination should be valid without the consent of the Metropolitan; and upon this particular occasion ratifie the Jurisdictions of all the other Metropolitans in the world over the Bishops of their own Province. But here it is pleasant to observe, with what confidence Learned men run away with a palpable mistake, either through prejudice or Interest: The *Scholiasts*, *Balsamon* and *Zonaras*, and all other Writers of later Ages, what they found practis'd in their own time, apply'd it to the primitive Church, and therefore Patriarchates having been of long standing, they take it for granted, without enquiry that they had always been, and so both *Balsamon* and *Zonaras* positively aver, That not only the Patriarchates of *Rome*, *Alexandria* and *Antiochia*, but that of *Jerusalem* it self was own'd by this Council over the Provinces of *Palestine*, *Arabia*, and *Phenice*, because so it seems, it had been before their time; but certainly if these men had not been stone-blind with prejudice, they could not but have seen that *Jerusalem* was then so far from any Patriarchal

archal dignity or Jurisdiction over those three Provinces, that it self was Subject to the Metropolitan of *Cæsarea*, whose Jurisdiction extended not beyond the Province of *Palestine*. Nay notwithstanding that its Subjection to the Metropolis of *Cæsarea* is expressly declared in the very next Canon, they are so bewitch'd with the Conceit of its being a Patriarchate, that when they read of its being a Subject Bishoprick, they believe it the very grant and Patent of its Patriarchal Institution. But then as for *Petrus de Marca*, a man who is scarce ever in the wrong, but when he dares not be in the Right, to be so peremptory in this mistake of the Primitive Antiquity of Patriarchates, that is so apparently inconsistent with all the Records of the Church, in which he was so accurately vers'd; it plainly shews what men are forc'd to do, that have business depending at *Rome*: And yet upon the Assurance of the unquestionable Truth of this Supposition, he thinks he demonstrates the *Popes* Supremacy, at least by Ecclesiastical Constitution, over the Western Churches. It is true he often asserts his Universal Jurisdiction over the Church *Catholick*, but that seems to be done for form sake, lest his Holiness should once more stop the Pall at his next Translation.

on. But the Fundamental Principle upon which he builds his whole work is the *Popes* being Patriarch of the *West*, and that as proved from the sixth Canon of *Nice*, and that is the very Argument of his whole first Book, which is the foundation of all that follow; I shall consider the whole discourse distinctly, and thereby it will appear, that all the Wit and all the Learning in the World (and he had a very great share of both) can do nothing without Truth, but much less against it. At least I shall make it evident, that the Bishop of *Rome* in those early times of the Church, had no pretence to any Patriarchal Power, much less over all the *Western* Churches.

And first what do we mean by a Patriarch, but the Bishop of a vast Diocese Superior to all the Metropolitans, or Provincial Bishops within his Diocese. For what ever Honours or Preheminences they enjoy'd besides, yet the thing by which they are distinguished from Metropolitans is their Authority over them, which was reduc'd to Practice according to the Bounds of the Diocesses, and that's the Definition that *Valesius* often gives us of a Patriarch, that he is *Metropolitanus Metropolitanorum*. Now it would be a pretty discovery to find such things as Diocesses

con-

containing many Provinces, either in the Christian Church or the *Roman* Empire, long before the Council of *Nice*; and yet if Patriarch's there had then been by ancient custom, Diocesses there must have been: Whereas there is nothing more evident then that there was no such thing till *Constantine's* new Model of the Empire. From that time forward we hear enough, and as will appear in the sequel of this discourse, too much of them in the Transactions of the Church. But before that time it would be a very new Discovery to find out such Diocesses in Christendom. Did not these Learned men know, that Diocesses were not older than *Constantine's* new Project of Government? If they did, and it is certain they could not be Ignorant of it, then certainly they must be Conscious to themselves, that they had undertaken a Cause, that they must, but could not maintain. And yet this very absurdity it self is one of the main Arguments, by which they would make good their Assertion; So *Valesius*: *In hoc capite sexto agitur de Episcopis qui regunt Dioecsin, non autem de his qui regunt unicam Provinciam, atqui Metropolitanam unam tantum Provinciam regunt, singuli enim præsunt Episcopis suæ Provinciæ. Patriarchæ vero Dioecsin id est multas simul junctas Provincias Admini-*

Observ. Eccl. in Soc. & Soc. lib. 3. cap. 2.

ministrant, & Subjectos sibi habent Metropolitanos; de his ergo intelligendus est hic Canon, non de Simplicibus Metropolitanis. Alioquin manca & imperfecta esset constitutio Patrum Nicænorum. That is in short, The Canon had been lame and imperfect, if it provided not for the Government of Diocesses as well as single Provinces. What, before there were any such things as Diocesses to be govern'd? If indeed they had been then in Being, and the Jurisdiction of the Church had been divided by their Limits, it might have been a neglect or an oversight not to take care of them; but when there was no such thing in the Christian Church, it is a very hard Imposition upon its Governours to require it as a Duty from their hands, to provide for all the Alterations of Government that may happen in the State. And yet, *Petrus de Marca* after all his Pains, is forc'd to dwindle this whole matter of Patriarchates, especially as divided into *Eastern* and *Western* into a kind of Prophecy. *Ita ut ab initio nascentis Ecclesiæ videatur esse delineata, illâ quasi futuri præsagâ distributione, Orbis Romani in Occidentis & Orientis Imperium divisio.* Into such dishonourable shifts do Learned men run themselves, when they Write for *Faction* not for *Truth*. This Learned man had first given

De Const.
Patriarch.
Instit. pag.
122.

given us an Account of the new State of the Empire from *Constantine*, and now immediately after that conforms the Model of the Church to it, as it was settled from the very time of the Apostles. What, when there was no such State in the World? Yes, yes, saith he, they did it by the Spirit of Prophecy. But what proof of that? this is plainly to forsake the Evidence of the Records of the Church, and to appeal to unknown Inspiration. His Assertion is that the Primitive Church design'd to conform its Government to the present State of the Empire, and yet not regarding that, he now declares that it fram'd it by a new Model that it foresaw would be set up 300. years after. These discourses become not the Ingenuity of Learned men, but men that are forc'd to serve a Cause or quit preferment, cannot help themselves. And yet after all the Assertion is as false, as it is vain and precarious; For if he could find but any one instance of a Diocess, or a Patriarch, or any ordinary Power Superior to a Metropolitan in the Church before the time of *Constantine*; I will allow him his Cause without the help of this Machin of Prophecy, but if there be no such thing, it is a very slender piece of wisdom to require the Churches care for the Government of its several
Dio;

p. 126. 127.

Diocesan divisions, when there were no such divisions in the World. And yet this very same Learned man a few Pages after tells that us this Settlement of the three great Patriarchates over the *Eastern* and *Western* Diocesses, was made *Secundum veterem superioris temporis consuetudinem*. What but just now was done by presage of what was to come to pass in after-times, is now done by the antient custom of former times. But this Custom is both as true, and as well prov'd as that Prophecy, it hath no other ground but the Learned mans own assertion, and no better proof than the Authority of *Zonaras* and *Balsamon*; though himself confesses that they speak (as it is manifest they do) according to the custom of their own time, and talk so carelessly as to affirm that the Patriarchate of *Jerusalem* over its three Provinces was settled at the same time. In short I cannot but stand amaz'd to hear this Learned man as well as others talk so perpetually of the Division of Diocesses before the Council of *Nice*, when it is Impossible that he could either be Ignorant or not aware that there was no such thing, either in Church or State till *Constantine's* new Constitution of the Empire. And that is an evident overthrow of all Patriarchal-pretences before that time, because there were till then no

Dio-

Diocesses, which is the first thing necessary to the very being of a Patriarch, a Diocess containing in it many Provinces.

But *Valesius* objects that the great Council had already provided for the Jurisdiction of Metropolitans in the fourth Canon, to what purpose then should it do the same again in the sixth? It might do it upon a new and particular occasion; In the fourth it might have settled the Jurisdiction of Metropolitans in general, and in the sixth it doth the same, for the Province of *Alexandria*, upon account of the present Controversie about *Meletius*, and for that reason probably it adds, a new Penalty, the deposition of the Offender. So that if this allegation were true, there is no Inconsistency in it, but that the Council might have provided for the same thing in both Canons. Though the Case is quite otherwise, for in the fourth Canon they only settled the Rights of Ordination; but, as *Valesius* himself observes in the sixth, they confirm all parts of Jurisdiction, and that sure is a sufficient addition to the fourth, and material enough for the making a new Canon.

But *Valesius* persists that when the Ordination of Bishops, by Metropolitans was provided for in the fourth Canon, the sixth must settle the Ordination of Metropolitans

tans by Patriarchs, how otherwise shall they be Ordain'd? This is a very unfortunate Argument, and utterly overthrows the Learned mans whole Design: When it is so well known, that long after that time all Metropolitans were ordained only by the Bishops of their own Province, and that there was no other Custom till after the Council of *Calcedon*. And if *Valesius* could have produced one Instance of their being ordain'd by a Patriarch, or any other than by their own Synod, it might have done his Cause some kindness; but when there is no such example, that is a manifest proof that there was no such Power.

But to what purpose is it for men to argue what ought to have been against what certainly hath been? For it is certain that these Canons speak only of ἐπαρχίας and the Bishops that presided over them, and that at that time there was no such thing as διοίκησις in the Christian Church, and therefore if we must be arguing, the Proof is demonstrative that what ever the Council appointed in the fourth Canon, or ought to have appointed in the sixth, that it is impossible it should have taken any care of Patriarchs or Bishops, as antiently presiding over Dioceses, because it is certain that there were then

then no Diocesses to be taken care of. And therefore it is a pleasant Interpretation that *Petrus de Marca* gives us of the ἄλλαι ἐπαρχίαι, ^{De Concord. l. 1. c. 3. §. 8.} that the words do not refer to all other Provinces in general, but particularly to the three great Diocesses of *Asia*, *Pontus*, and *Thrace*, that are here only intended. But alas it is too plain that ἐπαρχία will signifie nothing but a Province; and therefore if these alone were here intended, they were Provinces and not Diocesses. And then the ἄλλαι ἐπαρχίαι being joyn'd with those three great Sees of *Rome*, *Alexandria* and *Antioch*, they must be of the same nature too. But the great difficulty of all would be to find the Bishops of these Diocesses, at the time of the Council of *Nice*. For that there was then any Bishop presiding over all the Metropolitans of a Diocess; men have no grounds to believe than that their Cause requires it. And though it were true in it self, yet it is here precariously asserted by *de Marca*; for supposing that those three Diocesses were then in Being, what evidence hath he that the Council by the general words of ἄλλαι ἐπαρχίαι intended them only and not all others? Nothing at all but because he thinks it a pretty conjecture, for he is very fond of it, and hugs it at every turn. But a Con-

P

jecture

jecture without some ground is no better
 then a Dream; and the truth is, this is so
 far from any neatness of guess, that it is a
 most Enormous, if not a wilful mistake.
 For whereas he will have the Council in-
 tend by *ἀλλὰ ἐπαρχίας* the three Diocesses
 of *Pontus*, *Asia* and *Thrace*, he very well
 knew that the State of those places was
 quite different at the time of that Coun-
 cil; for by *Asia* before that time was un-
 derstood only the Proconsular *Asia*, of
 which *Ephesus* was the Metropolis;
 Whereas when it was made a Diocess, ten
 more and those large Provinces were laid
 into it. The Province of *Pontus*, of which
Cæsarea of *Cappadocia* was Metropolis,
 was confin'd to *Pontus* it self, but the Di-
 ocess of *Pontus* contain'd ten Provinces
 more beside it self. The Province of
Thrace, of which *Heraclea* was Metropo-
 lis, was no more than *Thrace* it self, but
 when it was made a Diocess, it contain'd
 six great Provinces within the Circuit of
 its Jurisdiction. So wild a Conceit was it
 in this Learned man to imagin that these
 single Provinces that were afterward mol-
 ded into vast Diocesses, had long been
 Diocesses before they were made so. If the
 Reader desire farther Satisfaction in this
 matter, beside the Records of the Church,
 and the *Notitia* of the Empire, he may con-

consult an excellent discourse upon it by *Petrus de Marcâ* himself, in his little Book *de Constantinopolitani Patriarchiatus Institutione* ; where he have an accurate Account of the State of the Church, both when it was Provincial , and when Diocesan, which will appear without any further pains to be sufficiently different. For example, that the Proconsular *Asia*, as a Province contain'd only the Kingdom of *Attalus*, but as a Diocesis it took in ten other Nations. And then the mistake is very exorbitant to confound the Diocesis of *Asia*, with the Province of it, at a time when there had been no such thing as a Diocesis, and then prove it by the after-practice of the Church. But this is an unusual thing with this Learned man, to prove the Prescription of former times by the practice of later times. Thus in his *Treatise de Constant. Patriarch. Institut.* he is very confident in it, that the Fathers in this Canon understand the Exarchs of these three Diocesses ; and this he proves from the Council of *Calcedon*, that makes mention of the Diocesan Exarchs. It does so, and it is the first Council that does it. But is not this a very inverted Method of interpreting the Records of the Church, that because we meet with Exarchs of Diocesses in the Council of *Calcedon*, that was as-

Pag. 149

sembled a hundred years after; therefore when the Council of *Constantinople* speaks of the Bishops of Provinces, they must be understood of these Exarchs, though there is no Record of any such Title or Dignity at that time? But the truth is this error of Confounding the State of the Church and Empire after *Constantine* with the State of both before, is very common among Learned men, and hath indeed brought great Confusion upon this whole matter. The ancient State of the Empire they describe or explain by the *Notitia* published by *Pancirollus*, that was not written till the latter end of *Theodosius* the younger, when the ancient State of the Empire was utterly demolish'd, and yet is this very Book made a Commentary upon the ancient Historians, *Dio Cassius*, *Suetonius*, *Strabo*, *Pliny*, *Tacitus* and all the Writers between *Augustus* and *Constantine*. And as for the Church, this is notorious, at least in all the Writers of the Church of *Rome*, to accomodate ancient Prescription to modern Practice, and derive what they find in use in the latter ages of the Church from the first times of it, though there are then no Footsteps of any such usage. Though the greatest Instance of this grand mistake is in *Carolus a Sancto Paulo*, who hath as he thinks or pre-

pretends, found out the Constitution of the Primitive Church from the Apostles to the Council of *Nice*, from no earlier Record than the Council of *Calcedon*, the *Justinian Code*, and other Writers after the great Alteration that was first settled by the Council of *Calcedon*.

§. XVI. For as for the Authorities alledged for the Primitive Institution of Patriarchat's, they are all of them after the time of the Council of *Nice*, and therefore there were none before it; and that is a sufficient presumption against their being at that time; for if they had been, it is impossible but that we must have heard something of them, that were the Supreme Power in the Church. And as they were all after the Council of *Nice*, so were most of them after the Council of *Calcedon*; by which Patriarchates were erected. As for those that wrote between the Interval of these two Councils, *Petrus de Marca* alledges some Authors that speak of Diocesses. And so they might without so much as dreaming of Patriarchates, because from the time of *Constantine* it was used as a term of Art in the division of the Empire. And the first time that we hear of the word Diocess at all, is from *Constantine* himself, who uses it in his

C. 3. Sect. 8.

*Euseb. de
vita Const.
lib. 3. c. 19.*

Speech concerning the Paschal Controversie, where he speaks of the Consent of the Bishops of the Diocesses of *Asia* and *Pontus*; for that was now their name in the new State of the Empire, but not a syllable of one Bishop over any Diocess. And he speaks of them as he doth in the same place of the Bishops of the *East*, *West*, *North* and *South*; so that from his words we may as well conclude a Patriarch for every quarter of the Compass, as for every Diocess of the Empire. And of the same nature are the passages that *Peter de Marca* alledges out of *Theodotius* and *Constantius*, who make mention of the Bishops of *Asia*, *Pontus* and *Thrace*, for they speak as Emperours ought to do, according to the Civil State of the Empire; neither do they speak of the Bishop, but the Bishops of each Diocess, and that is very far from any mention of a Diocesan Bishop. The first Author that speaks of the division of Diocesses and Institution of Patriarchates is *Socrates the Historian*, who attributes it to the second general Council. But if so, then however it is evident that there were none at the time of the first. Though besides that it is plain enough that he is mistaken, and that at the time of his Writing, though there were some that would have been pretending to
this

this Superiority, yet were there none legally and canonically settled. That he is mistaken appears from the Council it self, where there is no such thing Instituted; but on the contrary it is expressly forbidden, as will farther appear when I come to the Examination of the sense of that Council in this matter. And as for the several Patriarchs that he there sets down, the grossness of the mistake is notorious, in that they were no Patriarchs, but only Bishops of the Orthodox Communion, which were commonly call'd the ἐπίσκοποι κοινωνικῇ, as appears both by the sixth Canon annexed to this Council, where all are defin'd *Hereticks*, that seperate from the ἐπίσκοποι κοινωνικῇ (for so it ought to be read, and not κανονικῇ) and by the *Theodotian* Law it self extant in the *Code*, whereby it is enacted, that those only should be accounted Orthodox and allowed publick Churches, that kept Communion with and were approved by some certain Bishops of the Emperours Nomination, and these are the Bishops that *Socrates* Ignorantly enough calls Patriarchs, of the several Diocesses; though it is evident that some of them belong'd to one and the same Diocess, as *Helladius* Otrejus of *Militene*, and *Gregory* of *Nyssa* to *Pontus*, *Amphilochius* and *Optimus* to *Asia*; and

therefore they could not be Patriarch's of the new Diocesses, because there were more then one in a Diocefs. But if there were no division of Diocesses, or Institution of Patriarchates before the Council of *Calcedon*; How comes *Socrates* who liv'd before that time to dream of any such thing? This at the time of *Socrates* his Writing could be no great wonder; For it was not above seven or eight years before that Council, that his History was written. Before which time the Bishops of Diocesan Cities had been often labouring to raise themselves above the other Metropolitans, and appropriate to themselves the Titles of *Exarchs* of the Diocefs; and though they were often repuls'd by the Church, yet by this time they (especially the Bishops of *Constantinople* where he lived) had got Authority enough to maintain, and as it were by custom to Legitimate their Usurpation; and so *Socrates* finding them in some possession of their Power at the time of his Writing, what ought to have been ascrib'd meerly to their own Ambition, he either Ignorantly or Carelessly imputes to that very Canon of the second Council, that was made only to keep down the very Pretence to any such Power. Though, tis most probable that he took his account from
the

the current Opinion in that City at that time, (*viz.*) That such an Authority and Jurisdiction had been settled upon it by the *Constantinopolitan* Council, as we shall find it pleaded by the Clergy of *Constantinople*, in the Council of *Calcedon*.

As for the Testimonies of St. *Jerom*, *Innocent* the first, and *Johannes Scholasticus*, or *Antiochenus*, they need no Answer, because it is evident without any that they are gross mistakes. St. *Jerom* asserts that *Antioch* was made Metropolis of all the *East* by the Council of *Nice*; but with the Reserve of a *ni fallor*, if I be not mistaken. But that he was mistaken is put out of all doubt by the words of the Canon it self, where we meet not with the least mention of the *East*, much less of all the *East*, but only in general of *Antioch* and its antient Priviledges. And that *Antioch* had any Superiority or Jurisdiction over any of the *Eastern* Metropolitans, is a thing unheard of in *Ecclesiastical* History. So that this must plainly pass among one of St. *Jerom*'s many hasty Expressions, though the rashness of it is much abated by his *ni fallor*, a forme of Speech that he rarely uses, but when he writes at all adventures, as it is evident he doth here without any warrant or Authority. I know that some Learned men would bring
him

him off by saying that he means the Council of *Constantinople*, instead of that of *Nice*, in that not long after that Council there was compiled a *Code* of the Canons of the universal Church, in which the *Nicene* Canons bearing the Principal place, they gave the denomination to the whole Book. This I will grant to be true, but if it be, it is mending one mistake with another, because the Council of *Constantinople* no more owns any Patriarchal Jurisdiction either in that See or any other than the Council of *Nice*, as I shall prove when I come to consider it. But the best excuse that can be made for St. *Ferom*, and the most natural interpretation of his *ni fallor* is, that he Speaks according to the practice of his own time; for the Bishop of *Antioch* then challenged a Superiority over the *Eastern* Metropolitans, and most of them had submitted to his Usurpation; as *Innocent* the first informs us, who requires the Metropolitan of *Cyprus* to be Subject to the Bishop of *Antioch*, out of conformity to other Churches; and therefore St. *Ferom* finding him actually instated in this Jurisdiction; he after his hasty manner of writing passes it as an ancient Right, but because he knew no proof of it, he shelters his Assertion under the Reserve of a *ni fallor*. As for Pope *Innocent* his mistake,

it

it is the same with St. *Jerom's*, only worse *Epist. 18.* because more peremptory or rather more partial, and indeed he is too much a Party to be a Witness ; For about his time the *Exarchs* or Bishops of the great Cities began to domineer, and think themselves bigger than their Brother Metropolitans, and then whatever they did must have the formality of being justified by the Council of *Nice*, though the Council is utterly silent about it. And thus in his Epistle to the Council of *Toledo*, he ordains of his own head, that neither Lawyers nor Courtiers, nor Souldiers should be admitted into Holy Orders, and then warrants his own Decree by the Authority of the *Nicene* Canons, though there is no such Rule in all the Decrees of that Council. The nearest thing to it is enjoyning very severe Penance upon Souldiers, that had Sacrificed to Idols in the Persecution of *Licinius*, and that I take it is a matter very remote from Holy Orders. And so here when the Bishop of *Antioch* complains to his reconciled Friend or Master *Innocent*, that the Bishops of *Cyprus* would ordain their Bishops without consulting his *Exarchateship* (for that was the game at that time, though it would not hold) contrary to the *Nicene* Canons. His peremptory Answer is that they ought to observe the Can-

Canons, and submit to the same Government as other Churches did, that is, to the *Exarch* of the Diocess. All which is prov'd Notoriously false by the *Nicene* Canons themselves that assert no such thing, and so it was then judged by 200. Bishops in the Council of *Ephesus*, to whom a little after the cause was appeal'd, who condemn'd the Usurpation of the Bishop of *Antioch*, as an eminent Breach of the Liberties settled by the *Nicene* Council. So apparently false is the Allegation of this *Pope*, but forgery was his particular Talent, and it is the Custom of Usurpers to assist one another, till some one of them finds himself able to overtop all the rest, and then is he as much concern'd to trample them down, as ever he was to advance them; And so the Bishops of *Rome* were for the most part, at first, very forward to lend an helping hand to the Ambition of other Prelates, because how high soever these were raised, they themselves still mounted above them, till finding that they were arrived to their full height of Power, nothing less would serve their turn than an Universal Monarchy over their own Confederates as well as all other Churches. And for this reason this Presuming *Pope* here first gives his helping hand to the Bishop of *Antiochia*, because
he

he gave it for a Reason, that would give a greater Authority to himself, (*viz.*) That *Antioch* had once been the Seat of *St. Peter*, and was only Inferior to *Rome*, in that he sat there only for a time, and made it not the Seat of his fixed and perpetual Residence as he did *Rome*. And upon this he adviseth him to ordain his Metropolitans by his own singular Authority, and not to suffer his Metropolitans to ordain their own Bishops without his Allowance. This was at that time very humble advise, for that proud *Pope* that was not arriv'd to the Dignity of a *Servus Servorum*, and very agreeable to all the known Canons of the Church. But if by this means he could contract all the Power of the Bishops and Metropolitans of that great Diocese into the Bishop of *Antioch*, he very well knew that he had him Sufficiently at his own devotion; for *Alexander* the Bishop of *Antioch* had before-hand laid himself with all Humility at *Pope Innocent's* Feet, to be entirely govern'd, or if he pleas'd trampled upon by him. And the truth of it is that this *Innocent* the first was really the first *Pope*, as will appear through the whole *Sequel* of this Discourse. He first challeng'd the dependence of Foreign Churches upon the Apostolic See. He first broke down the old bounds of Metropolitica

*Epist. ad
Vilfric.*

litical Jurisdiction, by making the Gap for appeals of greater Causes to *Rome*. *Si autem majores causæ in medium fuerint devolutæ ad sedem Apostolicam, sicut Synodus statuit, post Episcopale Judicium referantur.* But what Synod that was, he is so wise never to declare, and that hath been the common custom of his Successors to justify their bold and unwarrantable Usurpations by meer pretence of Authority from ancient Canons. As *Pope Julius* in his counterfeit Epistle to the *Eastern Bishops*, is made to say roundly: *Cujus Apostolicæ sedis dispositioni omnes majores Ecclesiasticas causas & Episcoporum Judicia antiqua Apostolorum eorumq; Successorum, atq; Canonum Auctoritas reservavit.* This is bravely said, and nothing but the boldness of the Assertion bears out it self. For it would be a wise undertaking to find out any Apostolical Canon, Custom, or Constitution for Appeals to *Rome*. But as for *Pope Innocent* as he was the first that pretended to this Power, so was he high and Peremptory in his demands of it, particularly in his 24th. and 25th. Epistles to the Councils of *Carthage* and *Milevis*; and in his Epistle of Answer to the Bishop of *Macedonia*, he chides them in down-right terms: *adverti sedi Apostolicæ, ad quam Relatio quasi ad caput Ecclesiarum missa cur-*
re-

rebat, aliquam fieri injuriam, cujus adhuc in ambiguum sententia duceretur. And this because they had not immediately follow'd his Resolution, but desired his opinion upon better information of the Case. And though upon that he found that he had been mistaken, and was forc'd to quit it; yet he rates them for Suspending the Execution of his former wrong sentence as an injury to the Apostolical See the head of all Churches. In short this *Pope* was a man of an active and busy temper, and flush't with Success in all his undertakings, especially in the cause of *St. Chrysostom*, in which he brought the Emperour himself to Submission, conquer'd all the *Eastern* Bishops, and allow'd them his Communion only upon terms of Submission, in which the present Bishop of *Antioch* was most forward to comply, for which he endeavoured to requite him with an Authority over his Brethren, had not the general Council of *Ephesus* vigorously prevented it. In a word, he was the very *Julius Cæsar* and founder of the Papal Empire.

Lastly as for the Testimony of *Johannes Scholasticus* or *Antiochenus*, it lies under as many or more disadvantages than the rest. For first it is apparently false, not only as to the Canon of *Nice*, but of *Constantinople* and *Ephesus*, which he sets down

as Institutions of Patriarchal Jurisdiction, not only for the three Great Sees but for *Jerusalem* too, though it is so notorious that there was then no such thing as a Patriarchate there ; and for the other Councils I shall make it appear that their Canons were made with so little design of owning or abetting any such Power, that their only design was to suppress it. Secondly *Johannes Scholasticus* himself was a Patriarch, and that of *Constantinople*, which was all along the most encroaching See of all the Rest, and whose Ambition first raised the others, even *Rome* it self to this new dignity. And therefore he was as much or more concerned as a Party, than *Pope Innocent* ; the Patriarch of *Constantinople* looking upon himself at that time, as a much greater man than the Bishop of the then forsaken City of *Rome*. But the real ground of *Johannes Scholasticus*'s mistake is, that he liv'd at a time when this had been long granted and suppos'd an undoubted Truth ; and therefore he sets it down in course, without making any demur upon it, as many others had done before, and many more have done since. He liv'd in the time of *Justinian*, when Patriarchs were just arriv'd to their height, and so scorn'd to own any later beginning than the Apostolical times ; and therefore
this

this Pretence having pass'd so long uncontroul'd , it is no wonder that *Johannes Scholasticus* (especially in a case where himself was a Party, though a good and a Learned man) should so easily and heedlessly pass it in his Collection of Canons. It is needless to answer any of the latter Testimonies, when it is so clear that they all mistake the Priviledges granted to Provincial Churches for Patriarchal Dignities, only because they were so in their own time ; but otherwise there is a dead silence as to any such thing in all the more timely Records of the Christian Church, and they are the only competent Witnesses of the matter of Fact, whereas those that came some ages after gives us only their Opinion, but not their Testimony, and unless they could give us some ground for it from some more ancient Record, it is no better than a groundless Conceit of their own framing.

§. XVII. Hitherto our way is clear that there was no authoris'd Superiority of Patriarchs, or any other Order above Metropolitans, at or before the Council of *Nice*. But now as for those very few Learned men, that place their Institution somewhat lower, they fix it upon the second general Council held at *Constantinople*, though in that they seem to me to

Q

be

be much more mistaken than those that derive it from the first at *Nice*, for they that derive it from this, only impose upon the Canon, and make it say something, of which it is altogether silent; whereas these that fix it upon the second general Council, contradict it, and force it to vouch what it opposeth. For the second Canon, in which they suppose they find their Institution, was so far from being made with any design of Introducing or Confirming this new dignity, that the only design of it was to bridle the very attempts of its Usurpation, and to keep up the ancient Bounds of Metropolitcal Jurisdiction against the Invasions of those topping Bishops of Diocesan Cities, as will evidently appear from the words themselves, that run thus: *Let not such Bishops that are over the Diocess go beyond their own Bounds, lest they bring Confusion upon Churches; but according to the Canons, let the Bishop of Alexandria govern Ægypt, the Eastern Bishops the East, reserving to the Church of Antioch the priviledges and prebeminences that were confirm'd by the Nicene Fathers. And let the Bishops of the Asian Diocess govern Asia only, those of the Pontic, Pontus: those of the Thracian, Thrace. And let not Bishops unless they are requested to it, go out of the Diocess either*
for

for Ordination or any other Ecclesiastical Office. And now this Canon concerning Dioceses being observ'd, it is clear that the Synod of every Province ought to govern the Province as it was defin'd at Nice. One would think that the meaning of the Canon were plain enough for the restraint of any new pretended Diocesan Jurisdiction, and yet it is universally mistaken either for its first Institution, or at least its farther Ratification; and which of them it is, is become a Controversie among Learned men. Those few that deny it to have been settled by the Council of *Nice*, will have it to have been its first Institution, but this Opinion is eagerly oppos'd by *Petrus de Marca*, *Valesius* and many others, for no other Reason than that it was, as they think, antecedently settled by the Council of *Nice*. So that however, it is agreed on all hands, that the Canon was made in behalf of either the Settlement or Ratification of Patriarchates. As for those that derive it from the Council of *Nice*, they are consider'd already, but now as for them that make this their first Institution, they are induced to it, partly by the Authority of *Socrates* the Historian, who liv'd not long after, and partly from the seeming sence and novelty of the Canon itself, in setting Bounds to the Bishops of

Q 2

the

the Cities of the Diocesan divisions ; for this is the first time that we meet with any such thing in the Records of the Church, and therefore must needs be its first Institution. But as for the Authority of *Socrates*, I have considered that already, and shewn his undeniable mistake in making the appointment of *Communicatory Bishops* the Institution of Patriarchates, and Distribution of Provinces. Now to this it is in vain to answer, as some Learned men have done, that though the Catalogue of *Communicatory Bishops* follows immediately the Account of Patriarchs and Diocesses ; yet they relate not to the same matter, when it is so evident from the words themselves, that he speaks of one and the same thing. For when he had in general affirm'd that the Council had instituted Patriarchates and Diocesses, he proceeds to the particular settlement of the whole Affair, and tells us to what Bishops Patriarchates belong'd, and so reckons up the *Communicatory Bishops*, and calls the Jurisdiction of each by the Title of Patriarchates ; what then can be more clear than that he thought them true and proper Patriarchs ? And how he fell into that mistake, I have already accounted, though beside this grand mistake, he expresses himself so very ambiguously, that
after

after all he asserts nothing. *Thus* (saith he) *they instituted Patriarchs, and divided Provinces, so as that Bishops should not go beyond their own Diocesses to meddle with Forreign Churches.* What an huddle and confusion of words is here? They made Patriarchs because they divided Provinces, and they divided Provinces, because they confin'd Bishops within their own Diocess, as if the division of Provinces had been the Institution of Patriarchates, and the limitation of Diocesses the division of Provinces. So that it is plain that he was only confounded with the shuffle of things between the new Diocesses and the old Provinces; and so tells us in the Conclusion of all, after all his Stories of Patriarchs and Diocesans, that the Council determin'd that *as need requir'd* every Province should be govern'd by its own Synod.

But after all the Canon will best explain it self, and clear all difficulties if attended to without prejudice. The greatest difficulty lyes in the word *disiunctis*, because as it was new, so was it not arrived to any settled signification; for as this is the second or third time that we meet with it in the Records of the Church, so was it for some time, as most new words are, of a Fluctuating and uncertain sence, and not limited

to its own proper Import, (*viz.*) A Circuit of Government containing many Provinces, but was promiscuously used to denote any Bounds of Jurisdiction. So *Pope Syricius*, who was Install'd *Anno* 385. a very short time after this Council, not above four years, bids *Himerius* to Communicate his Rescript both to the Bishops, *qui in tua sunt Diocæsi constituti* of his own Diocess (that is *Tarracona*, that was a Provincial See in *Spain*) and to all the Neighbour Provinces ; so that Province was Synonymous with *Diocess* ; And *Pope Innocent* the first a few years after in his Epistle to *Florentius* Bishop of *Tibur*, charges him with Invading *Nomentum*, that belong'd to the Diocess of *Ursus* ; and yet it is certain that they were both but very small Bishopricks of *Italy*. And the Synod of *Rome*, in or about the same time in their Synodical Epistles to the *French* Bishops use the word *Diocess*, as Synonymous with Metropolitcal Jurisdiction, for so they express it, *Metropolitanus in sua Diocæsi*. And so doth the Synod of *Ephe-sus* in the case of the *Cyprian* Bishops, where it decrees that in all Diocesses and Provinces no Bishop Act beyond the Bounds of his own Province. From whence it plainly appears that for some time the word *Diocess* had no fixed signification, but that

as it was at first used as a term of Art in the new division of the Empire; so being a fashionable word at Court, it was soon apply'd to express all bounds of Jurisdiction. And so the *Scholiasts* themselves understand the words of the Canon: When a Bishop (says *Zonaras*) is here commanded not to go beyond his Diocess, the meaning is, that he move not out of his Province. And so *Balsamon*, the only design of the Canon was to preserve the Bounds of Jurisdiction, and not confound the Rights of Churches; and at last concludes from it, that at that time all Metropolitans were the Heads of their own Province, and were ordain'd by their own Synods; which though it be a Contradiction to their former Conceit of the *Nicene* Antiquity of Patriarchates, yet it shews that whenever they forget their Prejudices taken up from the Practice of later times, and consult the true and ancient Records of the Church, how easily and even unawares they are lead by them into a full acknowledgement of the Truth. For it is apparent from all the Records of that Age, that the term *διοικησις* had not obtain'd its settled sence in the Church, but only signified in general any Bounds of Jurisdiction, and so was for the most part apply'd to Provincial Churches.

The next difficulty or dispute will be, what is the meaning of οἱ ὑπὲρ διοίκησιν ἐπισκοπῶν, for the words themselves are capable of a double Sense from the Ambiguity of the word ὑπὲρ, that signifies either *above* or *beyond*, so that it may be rendred either the Bishops above the Diocess, as *Dionysius Exiguus* does, *Qui sunt super Diocæsin Episcopi*, or the Bishops out of their Diocess, as *Zonaras* expounds it. Though if we regard the design of the Canon, and the whole Contexture of the words, they plainly enough express their own meaning. For when it is said, let not Bishops over Diocesses, or Diocesan Cities go beyond their own bounds to invade foreign Churches; then the Scene is plain to restrain Bishops, especially those of the Diocesan Cities within the Circuit of their own Jurisdiction. But if we read it the latter way, let not Bishops out of their own Diocess go beyond their own bounds to forreign Churches, it is meer Non-sence, as if they should say, let not Bishops out of their bounds go beyond their bounds; for if they medled with Churches out of their Diocess, it is certain that they were beyond their bounds: So that it cannot be understood any other way than of that greater sort of Bishops in the new Diocesan Cities, who then

look'd

look'd too bigg, and encroach'd too boldly upon their neighbour Bishops. And that, it is plain, was the occasion of this Canon, that *Melitus* Bishop of *Antioch*, and *Peter* Bishop of *Alexandria* took upon them to Ordain Bishops of *Constantinople*, that was in the Diocess of *Thrace*. For the Government of the Lievtenant of the *East* was divided into five Diocesses: The *East* properly so call'd, *Ægypt*, *Asia*, *Pontus* and *Thrace*, and therefore it was look'd upon, as a new extravagance by this Council in these Bishops, one whereof was in the Diocess of *Ægypt*, and the other of the *East*, to take upon them any Jurisdiction in the Diocess of *Thrace*. And this new exorbitance being restrain'd, the Council adds, *That it will be clear enough from the Canon of Nice, that every Province is to be govern'd by its own Synod.* So that the Canon is still so far from instituting any of these new Diocesan Bishops over the old Metropolitans, that the only end for which it was made was to preserve the Supremacy of Power in Metropolitans, from any Diocesan Encroachment for the time to come. And as in the first part they are forbid to meddle out of the bounds of their own proper Diocess; so in the latter part are they from challenging any Superiority over the other Metropolitans

litals within the same Diocess ; the Council declaring that the Supreme Government of every Province was placed in its own Synod , and Metropolitan by the Council of *Nice*. And as there is no ground to imagine that this Council ever instituted any Superior Order to Metropolitans, but rather asserted their Supremacy against all Usurpations upon them; so as for the next general Council that was conven'd at *Ephesus* , it doth with more than usual vehemence secure the Metropolitcal Rights , against all these new Pretences of Encroachment. For upon occasion of the great Bishop of *Antioch*'s taking upon him, partly by the encouragement of *Pope Innocent* the first, whom I have already observ'd to be the first *Pope*, but more by the huffing Assistance of *Dionysius*, a Commander in the Army, and then Governour of *Antioch* (as the *Cyprian* Bishops represent their Case to the Council) to ordain Bishops in the Isle of *Cyprus*, which had been a Church within it self by immemorial Prescription ; It does not only confirm the ancient Rights and Jurisdictions of that Province, but of all other Metropolitan Churches ; and that with this smart resentment , lest under Pretence of *Sacerdotal* Power, the *Pride* of secular Dominion be brought into the Church,

Church, and by degrees we be deprived of that Liberty, in which our Saviour hath instated us, and for a farther security against all future Usurpations upon the Metropolitcal Power, the Council orders all Metropolitans to take out and keep Copies of the Acts of the Council *πρὸς τὸ οἰκεῖον ἀσφαλὲς* for every mans own especial security.

s. XVIII. And as no such Power is hitherto own'd by the general Councils, neither is it mention'd or any way intimated by any Provincial Synods: and to pass by the rest, that treat of other matters, the two chiefest that concern the Discipline and Government of the Church are, the Council of *Antioch* in the *East*, and *Sardica* in the *West*. And yet it was altogether unknown to both. The Synod of *Antioch* was conven'd *Anno Dom. 341.* and among many Canons that it makes about Appeals, it makes no mention of Patriarchal Appeals, but supposes the last possible Appeal to be made to the Metropolitan and Synod of the Province. Thus in the 9th. Canon they enjoyn, that Bishops do nothing but what concerns meerly their own Bishoprick without their Metropolitan, as it is commanded by an ancient Canon of the Fathers. Now that ancient Canon

Canon can be no other than the 34th. Apostolical Canon, which is here repeated almost in the very same words; unless it be that he that is there call'd the *first Bishop*, is here stil'd *Metropolitan*, which word was not brought into use in the first and second Ages of the Church, and that by the way shews the Antiquity of the Apostolical Canons, that they never use it, but in its stead always make use of the plain and simple Phrase of the *first Bishop*, that was us'd by the Writers of that Age and some time after, as the Metropolitan See is stiled by the Council of *Illiberis*, that was but 20. years older than the Council of *Nice*, *prima Cathedra*, and from hence came the term of *Primates*, peculiar to the *African Church* for *Metropolitans*.

*De Primatu
Papæ. c. 3.*

And here by the way I cannot but take notice of one Instance of *Salmasius* his Ingenuity, who indeed took great pains in reading the Ancients only to pervert them. He having occasion to quote this Apostolical Canon, that supposes and does not institute these *first Bishops*, from thence concludes, that these Canons were made long after the Apostles, because there was no such thing as *Metropolitans* in their time, whereas there is no one thing more evident in the Records of the Church than their Existence from the beginning; so that
the

the whole force of his Argument lyes meerly in his own Confidence, oppos'd to the evidence of Truth it self. And though we affirm not that these Canons were compiled by the Apostles themselves, yet they were by Apostolical men that succeeded in the Ages next after them; of which beside many other Proofs, *Salmasius* hath here given one, whilst he is disparaging their Antiquity, because he observes that this is the very Canon that is quoted by the Council of *Antioch*, as an ancient Canon, and if so, then there is no avoiding it, but that its Antiquity must rise up into the two first Centuries after the Apostles, and we pretend no higher. Though after his constant custom of contradicting himself, as well as the Records of the Church, when he hath so positively asserted, that the Council of *Antioch* quotes this very Canon: *Quis non credat vidisse eos illum Apostolorum Canonem, & de eo hic intelligere, præsertim cum ipsissima verba ponant quæ in illo extant?* The next thing that he undertakes to prove after this, is, That the Council of *Antioch* quote no Canon at all, because the word *κανών* signifies Custom as well as Law, and may be so understood here; What? when you have just prov'd that 'tis so undenyably evident that it quotes this Law word for word?

word? So that though the word Canon may signifie Custom; yet here it cannot, because it is so evident from the words themselves, that they refer to an ancient Law, and not a Custom; and yet that the Apostolical Canons were more ancient than the Council of *Antioch*, is plain from their using the term of *first Bishop*, instead of Metropolitan; so that our *Grammarian* might have spar'd all his tedious glossing upon the word *κανών*, though the truth of it is he cannot help it, it is his natural faculty; and his whole Book is more like a *Dictionary* than a controversial discourse.

But to proceed, as this Canon of *Antioch* makes no Provision for Bishops beyond their Metropolitan, so neither does it for Metropolitans beyond their own Synod; whereas had there been any higher Power in the Church, it must have allow'd and enjoin'd appeals to its last Judgement. Nay the Fathers of this Council were so far from dreaming of any farther Ecclesiastical Appeal than to Provincial Synods, that they could not devise any other delay than by flying to the Secular Power, and therefore it is enacted Canon the 11th. That if any Clergy-man shall appeal from the Ecclesiastical Rule to the Emperour without leave from the Metropolitan and Synod,

nod, he shall be depriv'd both of Communion and Dignity; and in the very next Canon is depos'd for ever without hope of Restitution, unless by a greater Synod. And by Vertue of this Canon was *St. Chrysostom* kept out of his See of *Constantinople*, after he was restor'd by the Emperour and a Synod of Bishops, because the Synod that restor'd him was less than that which depos'd him. And in the 14th. Canon it is provided, That if the Bishops of the Province cannot agree in their Sentence upon an accused Bishop, that the Metropolitan may call in the help of the Bishops of the next Province; that was the last appeal they could devise. And therefore in the 15th. Canon, The Bishop that is Sentenc'd by the unanimous Vote of the Bishops of the Province hath no appeal, which could never have been decreed, had there been at that time any such Power and Dignity as Patriarchal Thrones. And therefore *Justinian* when he Enacts this Canon into a Law, *Novel* 167. he then allows the last Appeal to the Patriarch, because then that order was brought in, which was unknown to the Fathers of this Council. And so *Balsamon* in his Notes upon this Canon starts the Question, Whether it allows appeals from a Patriarch to the Emperour, and when he

he hath given the Opinions and Reasons of Lawyers on both sides, his own is, That this Law was made before the compleat constitution of the Church was finish'd, and therefore it makes no mention of Patriarchs, *that is to say*, because there were none at that time: Though this is very consistent with his Notes upon the sixth Canon of *Nice*, where he will have that Council to confirm the ancient Rights of the four Patriarchates, and yet now they were not known at the time of this Council, that was assembl'd near 20. years after; but it is an usual thing with him unawares to forget himself into the Truth.

As for the Council of *Sardica*, that was conven'd about six years after that of *Antioch*, and was of a peculiar Nature from all the other Councils; for though the Bishops were summon'd out of both Empires to the Council; yet the *Eastern* Bishops forsook it, so that it consisted meerly of the *Western*; and they being thus left to themselves, began to make their Complements to the great See of *Rome*, that was the only Prerogative Bishoprick in the *West*; all the other great Sees going along with the *Eastern* Empire. And this little accident was the first Foundation of the *Roman* greatness; for though the particular honour that this Synod gave it was
little

little more than meer Courtship and Civility; yet in process of time they rais'd it to the heighth of Power, as we shall see afterwards. But as for the Council it self, that was so far from owning any such Inherent Supremacy in him, that it still limits the Supreme Jurisdiction to the Metropolitan and Bishops of the Province. Thus in the very third and fourth Canons, that are the Darlings of the Church of *Rome*, it is decreed that Bishops that have any Controversies among themselves do not seek for Judges out of their own Province; only it is propounded by *Hofius*, *That if any one shall think himself aggriev'd, if it seem good to the Council, in honour to the memory of St. Peter, Julius Bishop of Rome, if he judge it convenient, may appoint a Review of the cause by Neighbouring Bishops.* And, Canon the fifth, by sending some of his own Presbyters to sit in Commission with the Bishops. In all which it is suppos'd that there was no settled Right of Appeal beyond the Metropolitan: And though the Council is pleas'd to allow a small kind of Priviledge to the Bishop of *Rome*, to order a Review of the Cause in the same Province where it had been adjudg'd, without any Power of judging it himself; they do not own any former Right or Custom for this Priviledge, but

R

now

now grant it out of a meer pang of complement in the President *Hofius*, to the memory of St. *Peter*, or rather out of kindness to his friend the present Bishop of *Rome*. And yet they were so tender of allowing any real Right of Appeal, that they durst not own the name, and therefore express it very modestly in the fifth Canon, *that if as it were appealing*, the Party aggriev'd should fly for Sanctuary to the Holy Bishop of *Rome*; so as they do not allow any real Appeal of the cause, because he had no power to judge it himself, but could only return it to be judg'd in its proper place, so neither do they allow this small Priviledge, to be a proper Appeal, but *as it were an Appeal*. And yet how did this slender *as it were*, swell it self in after ages to an immensity of Power, and swallow up all the real Authority of the Christian Church into it self. So dangerous a thing is it to pass Complements upon that designing See, that can make so much Advantage out of so slight a Civility; For we shall at last find that this was the first Plea for all their Greatness. But at present it is evident, that the Fathers of this Council knew no ordinary and standing Superiority of Power above Metropolitans, nor any larger extent of Jurisdiction than Provinces. So that hitherto any
higher

higher Orders were unreceiv'd both in the *Eastern* and *Western* Church, and for a good time after, as appears from the general Council of *Ephesus*, which though but twenty years older than that of *Calcedon* would own no such thing; but on the contrary (as we have seen in the case of the *Cyprian* Bishops) expressly confirm'd all the ancient Metropolitocal Supremacies.

§. XIX. And yet in the ninth Canon of the great Council of *Calcedon*, we meet with a new sort of Officers above Metropolitans call'd the *Exarchs* of the Diocess; the Canon runs thus: *If any Clergy-man have a Controversie with another, he is first to refer it to his Bishop, before he bring it to the Secular Court; if with the Bishop himself to the Synod of the Province; if with the Metropolitan of the Province, to the Exarch of the Diocess; or to the Throne of the Royal City of Constantinople.* Here is apparently a new order of *Exarchs* superior to the Metropolitans, but how they first came in is the great Riddle of Ecclesiastical Story, (*viz.*) To find a new order of Priesthood thus sprung up on the suddain in the Christian Church, like *Melchisedek*, from an unknown Birth and Parentage; and there is not a stranger

thing in all the Records of the Church , than that such an exorbitant Power should so suddainly and insensibly settle and authorise it self without any other Authority than barely its own possession ; for as it was hitherto beat down by all the Councils of the Church ; so this Council does not institute the Order , but only ratifies that Power in which they pretended to be actually instated. Now how is this possible, or how could it ever come to pass and not to be taken notice of in the Records of the Church , especially if it be true , as I pretend to have prov'd , that those Canons and Decrees of Councils, that have hitherto pass'd for the Patent of their Institution , were made on no other Design than to assert the Supreme Rights of Metropolitans against all such uncanonical Encroachments ? But though this may at first, seem a great Difficulty, yet if we take a right Method to examin the matter, the difficulty will clear it self. And that is by beginning our Enquiry where others leave off theirs : For as they end with the Institution of the Patriarch of *Constantinople*, which is Universally suppos'd to have been the youngest of them all; the business was so far from that, that it was the first born, and indeed gave being to all the rest : So that had it not first lead the way, they

they could never have arriv'd to that height of Power and Dignity. This I doubt not to make out of the Records of the Church, and trace its whole Progress from its first beginning to its last perfection.

First then *Constantine* the Great built *Constantinople*, either out of disgust to the *Senate* of *Rome*, for their Averſion to the Chriſtian Religion, as *Zozimus* would ſuggeſt; or for the Convenience of its Situation, as a fit place for the Emperours Reſidence againſt the Incurſions of the Barbarous Nations, that then firſt began to Infeſt the Empire; but moſt probable it was from his natural Magnificence and ſence of Glory, to have a great City call'd after his own Name, which had been the Ambition of all former Emperours; but it was his fortune, that as he excell'd them all in Magnanimity and greatneſs of mind, ſo to out-ſtrip them in the Succeſs of Grandeur and Glory; But moſt eſpecially in the ſuddain Growth and Greatneſs of this City, which as it obtain'd the name of *Rome* together with his own, ſo it did its State and Beauty. It had its Senate, the ſame Orders of men and Magiſtrates, the ſame Enſigns of Dignity, the ſame Exemptions, Priviledges and Honours; in ſhort, the Rights and Prerogatives of the *Quirites*

or Citizens of *Rome*. To which he added many great Gifts of his own Munificence, as particularly 4000 Measures of Corn daily distributed among its Inhabitants. And as it soon equall'd old *Rome* in Power, so it excell'd it in Beauty, Ornament and Pleasure. He rob'd all other places, even *Rome* it self to Beautifie this; he adorn'd it with its Capitol, its *Circus maximus*, *Amphitheatres*, *Forums*, *Porticuses*, *Baths*, *Column's*, *Statues*, *Pyramids*, and every thing that could give it State or Beauty. Now all this could not but draw a great Concourse of People to a Place endow'd with so many Priviledges, and the Succeeding Emperours fixing the Court there, so multiply'd the Inhabitants, that in a short time it became the head City in the World, and so dispeopl'd *Rome* it self of its Citizens, that *Pletho* calls it ἀπομείαν τῆς ἐν Ἰταλίᾳ Ρώμης. Neither was it much less beholden to the following Emperours than to its Founder; they seem to contend who should shew it most favour, as the best Monument they could leave of their own Fame, so that there were none of them that were not great Benefactors to it. *Constantius* (who no doubt must have a particular kindness for it, because it was founded at the Solemnity of his being made *Cæsar*;) constituted a *Præfect*. there;

there; that was the only thing which was wanting in it of the Government of *Rome*, and to him lay Appeals from the Governours of *Pontus*, *Asia*, and *Thrace*. The first thing that *Valentinian* and *Valens* did, when they came to the Empire was to retrieve the great Bounty of *Constantine* for Victualling the City, settling a certain portion of Bread out of his gift of Corn upon each House; so that it was as it were part of the Fee simple, and was bought and sold with the House it self. And whereas the Tyrant *Procopius* had in the time of his Rebellion violated the *Jus Italicum* of the City, *i. e.* its exemption from all manner of Taxes, *tam capitis quam soli* (as the Law expresses it) by Imposing severe exactions, not only upon the Citizens, but the Senators themselves, the Emperour *Valens* immediatly after the Tyrants overthrow, restores its ancient Rights by an Edict extant in the *Theodosian Code*, *Tom. 5. Tit. 13.* as he expresses it, *arbitrâ æquitate*, because of its equality to *Rome*, and that was ever the Reason for any new priviledges that were at any time granted to it. And besides the Particular kindness of this his first Law, he was all his life time a great Favourer and Benefactor of this City, adorning it with many publick Buildings, *Aquæducts*, *Bathes*, and

Churches, beside a great many constitutions for its Benefit and Honour, extant under their several Titles in the *Theodosian Code*, *de annonis Civicis*, *Lege 7. De studiis Libert. Urb. Rom. & Const. lib. 20. de Prætoribus*, *lib. 3. De Dignitatibus Ord. lib. 1. & 5. Et de Decurion. lib. 93.*

Præf. 6.
—Pag. 61.

But above all *Theodosius* the great, as he came nearest of any to *Constantine* in the greatness of his Actions, so did he in kindness to this City. *Themistius* the Philosopher in his Orations, hath given us an ample Account of his Munificence, of which after having recounted all Particulars he concludes ; *That it will hence forth remain doubtful , whether of the two Cities be greater and more beautiful, that which Theodosius adds to Constantinople, or that which Constantine added to Byzantium.* Now this City being grown to so much greatness, and having overtop'd old *Rome* in State and Glory , it is no wonder if it affected the same Grandeur in Religion ; and as it was equall'd to old *Rome* in all other things, so it ought to be in the Dignity of its Prelate and Precedency of its Church. And accordingly it soon compassed this Design under the Favour and Patronage of this Emperour, who was an equal friend both to the City and to Religion ; and therefore as he was always for

forward enough (perhaps too much) to do any Honour to the Church, so no doubt he was more particularly Zealous to advance it there for the Honour of the City: And therefore having Occasion to Summon a general Council, he was pleas'd to Honour the City with it, where *Gregory Nazianzen* having in Obedience to the Canons of the Church resign'd the Bishoprick, because he was uncanonically elected to it; the Emperour either is or seems more than usually Solicitous about the choice of a Bishop, for the great and Imperial City; and the matter was so ordered either by Chance, or, as is most probable, by Design of the Emperour, though Flattery imputed it to Providence, that *Nectarius* a man of the *Senatorian* Order, of great Dignity in the State, very popular for the Curtesie and Obligingness of his Conversation; but above all an intimate favorite of the Emperour was plac'd in the Bishoprick. For the Emperour having commanded the Bishops to deliver him *Schedules* of the Names of those Persons, that they would nominate to his choice; it happen'd that the Bishop of *Antioch* (as 'tis said) meerly to please the Fancy of *Diodorus*, an old Doting Bishop (though they call'd his Dotage Inspiration) nam'd *Nectarius*, a Person altogether unqualified
by

by the Canons, the last in his *Schedule*, whom the Emperour Immediately pitch'd upon: and though he were then Unbaptiz'd, and so by the Canons incapable of a Bishoprick; and was for that Reason at first refus'd by the Bishops of the Council; yet the Emperour persisting in his choice, they were forced to yeild, and so *Nectarius* being immediately Baptiz'd, he was, whilst in his *Neophytes habit*, constituted Bishop of *Constantinople*. Now this great man being plac'd in the *Episcopal Throne* of this great City, and made head of the great Council assembled in it; the Council proceeds to action, and after the Confirmation of the *Nicene Faith*, they ratifie the old Provincial Constitution of the Church, that every Province should be govern'd by its own Synod, as I have shewn above out of the Canon it self, and as it is expressly attested by *Sozomen*. And now having thus shewn their tender care of all other Churches Rights, they might with the less Jealousie and Suspicion enhance their own, and therefore the next decree that immediately follows is to assign its *Præcedency of Honour* next to *Rome*. And that was artificial enough to seem to be content with its usual Power, and not to endeavour the advancing it self to any greater Authority than of an inferior

ferior Bishoprick, but only out of respect to the Imperial City of *new Rome*, that it might be allow'd the *πρεσβεία τῆς πύλης* the *Precedency of Honour* next to *old Rome*, the same thing that the Council of *Nice* had done for the Church of *Jerusalem*, reserving the Rights of Jurisdiction to the Metropolis of *Cæsarea*; and this is the most this third Canon could pretend to grant after the enacting of the second; for when they had confirm'd the Provincial Settlement of Churches, *Constantinople* having ever been Subject to the Metropolis of *Heraclea*, the Council could not pretend to raise it to any higher Power, than of a Subject Bishoprick, without manifest injury to its Metropolitan. So that this Council was so far from allowing this great City any Power Superior to Metropolitans, as 'tis commonly supposed, that it did not so much as attempt to raise it to Metropolitical Authority, but left it under the Power of the Metropolis of *Heraclea*, to which it had belong'd from the beginning. And this no doubt was the ground of that custom, that continued for a long time after that it was raised up to a Patriarchate, that the Patriarch of *Constantinople* was consecrated by the Bishop of *Heraclea*, in token (as *Balsamon* upon the Canon observes) that he had been
once

Hist. Rom.
Lib. 6.

once Subject to him ; and this custom he sayes continued to his own time , *i. e.* towards the end of the eleventh Century, and *Nicephorus Gregorius* continues it down into his own Age, and that is the fourteenth. But as this Precedency of Honour was granted to *Constantinople* ; first in the City it self ; secondly under *Theodosius* its Patron ; thirdly when *Nectarius* , a great man, was its Bishop ; so lastly was it done when there were none but *Eastern* Bishops present at the Council ; and therefore we shall find it ever after opposed by the *Popes*, though at last it was allow'd of by *Innocent* the third, who began to Reign in the year 1199. in the Council of *Lateran* ; that is, when the Patriarch of *Constantinople* was reduc'd to so low a Condition , that there was no danger of his ever being Rival to his *Holiness*. *Baronius* and after him *Binius* , is confident in it, that the Canon it self is Supposititious ; partly because it was for so long time disown'd by the Church of *Rome*, partly because it apparently contradicts the preceeding Canon. But that it was genuine is evident from all the ancient Copies of the Councils, from the clear and concurrent Testimonies of the *Historians*, from the Authority of the Council of *Calcedon*, who cite it in their Synodical Epistle to
Pope

Ad annum
381.

Pope Leo; so that there can be no doubt of the *Authenticallness* of the Canon it self, neither is its being disliked at *Rome* any proof of its Forgery, for that was never pretended by the *Popes* themselves; and it only shews the Jealousie of that See, that was always particularly watchful against the growth of *Constantinople*. And for its contradiction to the former Canon, nothing more common in such cases than for men when they have Ambitious Designs in their heads to protest against them, and methinks one so thoroughly knowing in the History of his own Church as this Learned *Cardinal* was, should not be unacquainted with such flights. But after all he is plainly mistaken, for the Council doth not give the Bishop of *Constantinople* any Preheminence of Authority, as he imagins, but only precedence of Honour, and that makes no Alteration in the *Nicene* bounds of Jurisdiction: For every Metropolitan notwithstanding that, still enjoy'd the same Supremacy of Power within the Precincts of his Province. But though the Canon were not Spurious, it is more than probable, that it was clancular and obtain'd by Surprise, because the Synod, as this Learned Historian very well observes, in their Synodical Epistle to *Pope Damasus*, in which they give an Account
of

apud Theo.
lib. 5. cap. 9.
m

of all their Actions and Proceedings, make not the least mention of it; nay they seem diligently to suppress it, as a thing to be kept from his knowledge, and as doubting of his Consent. And that which shrewdly increases this suspicion is, that though they leave this out in their Synodical Epistle to the Bishop of *Rome*, and put him off with a general account of things, and a solemn story of their great Respect to the *Nicene* Council; yet when they write to the Emperour himself, they send him their particular Canons, as one to whom the Design might be imparted, and who probably set it on foot, at least they knew that he would take it kindly of them as an Honour done to his *Royal City*. But however this business was managed, whether fairly or fraudulently, this See being thus advanc'd to the height of Honour and Dignity, that alone was enough to mount it up to a Supremacy of Power; Some attempts of Usurpation had been made from the time of *Eusebius* of *Nicomedia*, who was an Active and a Bold man, and much the most powerful Prelate of his time, and therefore when he was Translated to *Constantinople* by the Emperour *Constantius* his Favour, and that too with an high hand; there is no doubt but a man of his Temper assisted with so much

much Court-Power and Interest, would be very forward to advance and enlarge the Authority of his See; and accordingly we find his Successor *Eudoxius* extending his Power to the Province of *Helespont*, before the Council of *Constantinople*, ordeining *Eunomius* Bishop of *Cysicum*, the Metropolitan City of the Province. But from this time forward *i. e.* from the *Constantinopolitan* Council, we perpetually find the Bishops of *Constantinople* encroaching upon the Jurisdiction of their Neighbours, openly violating the Ecclesiastical Canons by an exorbitant use of its greatness, swallowing up not only whole Provinces but whole Diocesses into its Usurpation, till at last it push'd fair for the universal Supremacy; and had once seiz'd it but it could not hold it. Its most observable irregularities between the second and fourth Council, when it was advanc'd from an honorary title to a real Power and Jurisdiction, I shall here remark, and shew the several Steps and Methods, whereby an empty dignity may improve it self into a Supremacy of Power.

Philostorgius.

§. XX. And in the first place, the very erecting the Committee of *Communicatory* Bishops by *Theodosius*, immediately after the Council of *Constantinople*, was a plain

plain Subversion of the ancient Government of the Church. For it took away all Power in the Synods of the Province and plac'd it in one or two hands, and sometimes made a private Bishop Superior in Authority to his Metropolitan, because some of the Committee were Subject Bishops, and yet the Right to Christian Communion, not only in their own Province, but the whole new Instituted Diocess that contained several Metropolitans, was at their single disposal. So that I take this Edict of *Theodosius*, how well so ever it might have been intended, to have been one of the first open Breaches that was made upon the Original Constitution of the *Christian Church*; for now the Government of it was turn'd out of its old Channel, where it had run from the time of the Apostles, the Synod of the Province under their Metropolitan, and diverted into new guts and courses as the favour or wantonness of the Court was pleased to appoint. So that though *Theodosius* were a great Patron of the Church, yet by not protecting of it the right way, he did it great Injury; for instead of giving it the effectual Assistance of the civil Government, he out of too much Zeal Invaded the Ecclesiastick Authority, by assuming to himself a Power of erecting
new

new Models of Government, which is in effect to destroy the Being and Constitution of a *Christian Church*; for if it stand upon divine Right from our *Saviour* and his *Apostles*, it is then in no mans Power to alter it; If it does not, 'tis no Church, for there can be no such thing without Institution by *divine Authority*. And to lay the foundations of a Church or Religion no deeper than humane Law, is to declare it an Imposture and artifice of State. But to proceed; as these Bishops were made heads of the *Catholick Church*, contrary to all the ancient practice of it; so was it no less a Novelty to make *Nectarius* the Head of the *Combination*; For as that made some few Metropolitans, together with four or five privat Bishops, Superior to all the *Provincial Synods* and Metropolitans in the World; so this made a privat Bishop Supreme head of the *Catholick Communion*. And then beside, whereas the *Jurisdiction* of other Bishops is limited to their own Diocesses, as to *Ægypt*, the *East*, *Asia*, *Pontus* and *Scythia*, there is no confinement set to his Authority, but it is express'd in general terms without restraints or *Limitations*; For which the writers of the Church of *Rome* assign a very apposite Reason, particularly the wisest of them all, the Learned *Petrus de Marca*:

S

*De Concord.
Sac. & Imp.
l. 1. c. 3. §.
Be- 10.*

Because (saith he) the Council had rais'd the Bishop of Constantinople to the second Place next to the Bishop of Rome, and for that Reason therefore, he must after the Example of that, have an unconfin'd Jurisdiction. And if this Learned man could have found us any Example at that time, of any such Power in the Bishops of Rome, it would have been a notable hint of their Supremacy. But when there is no such thing upon Record, and when the Bishop of Rome is particulrally left out of this Association, it is a shrewd Intimation that his universal Supremacy was but little known or talk'd of in those days; But it is pleasant to see how this Learned man can suit his Reasons to his Cause, and blow either hot or cold out of the same mouth as his own and the Popes convenience requires. For when he is to depress the See of Constantinople, then the reason why he had no particular Diocess assign'd him in the Association, is because he had none, and therefore his Jurisdiction was extended only to the City of Constantinople. And thus he who but just now was one of the two Bishops that presided over the whole world, is here confin'd to the Government of one City, must be content with the narrow fortune of other ordinary Bishops, and not be so vain as to equal himself

self with the great Sovereign Bishop of *Rome*. But though his former Reason was founded upon a palpable falshood, yet it is possible that this may be true, and that the Edict design'd only that City to the particular Care of *Nectarius*, and if it did, that alone gave him great Influence over all the Bishops of the Empire, by reason of their great Resort thither, and their frequent occasions to make use of his interest to promote their Suits at Court, which would in course oblige them to some deference to his Authority; So that in a little time the Bishops of *Constantinople* took upon themselves together with the Bishops that were occasionally there present; the Government of all other Churches. And that was one of the most artificial flights in all their Usurpation, the trick of getting a Synod of Bishops: For they being of the inferior Rank of Bishops, they had no right to assemble Synods, and without Synods they could exercise no Power canonically; and therefore to supply this want, they made use of this Advantage, that there being always a great number of Bishops more or less residing at *Constantinople*, and attending about the Court, upon emergent Occasions the Bishop of the City was wont to consult with them, which meetings in process of time obtain'd

both the Name and Authority of Synods. The most remarkable Instance that I know of this kind, was in the Proceedings of *Anatolius* with his Conclave against *Photius* Bishop of *Tyre*, which were so foul that the very Council of *Calcedon* were ashamed of them, as we find in the 4th. Action of that Council. The Business was this, The Citizens of *Beryte*, that was Subject to the Metropolis of *Tyre*, had obtain'd of the Emperour the Grant of Metropolitcal Supremacy, and an alienation of a great part of the Province of *Tyre* to be laid to its Jurisdiction. Which Grant *Anatolius* ratifies, and threatens *Excommunication* to *Photius* the *Tyrian* Bishop, if he consent not to it. This being so great a Violation of the Rights of the Church, especially when *Photius* was no way Subject to his Jurisdiction, it was complain'd of to the Council, and by them condemned, and the Convention of Synods at *Constantinople* disown'd and declared to have no Synodical Authority. Neither had *Anatolius* any thing to plead in his own Justification but only Custom: He durst not so much as pretend to any Canonical Right; that it seems was too Impudent, but a kind of convenient custom, for the more easie determination of emergent Controversies; because there
was

was alwayes a sufficient number of Bishops residing upon the Place, and so were ready at hand to decide matters brought before them without the trouble of calling Provincial Synods upon every occasion. So that this one Instance, though no elder than the Council of *Calcedon* proves a more ancient custom; for thereby *Anatolius* excuses himself, and the Bishops that joyn'd with him; that what they did was no new thing, not so much as *Novitati affine*, but had been practic'd of old. And the Instances of this kind are very frequent; it was such a Synod, by which *Flavian* Bishop of *Constantinople* first condemn'd *Eutyches*, and therefore *Eutyches* excepts against their Authority, because they were not canonically Summon'd, but were casually met at *Constantinople* for their own private Affairs: Many more Instances there are of this kind in the Actions of *Atticus*, *Proclus* and *St. Chrysostom*, who in these Synods settled matters that belong'd to other Metropolitans; And as for *St. Chrysostom* (who probably first began this custom) he got himself restored to his Bishoprick by such a Court Synod, though his Restitution would not hold, because his Synod was not of equal number with that by which he was deposed. But to return to *Theodosius* his Instrument of Ca-

*Act 1. Conc.
Calced.*

tholick Association, and *Petrus de Marca's* Remarks upon it, that the Bishop of *Constantinople's* Power was not limited : First, Because it resembled the *Popes* that had no bounds. Secondly, Because he had no Diocess to be limited ; and though this last may be true, yet I am apt to think that the most probable Account of the thing is, that the Emperour in his Edict design'd neither a limited nor an unlimited Jurisdiction to his Favorite Bishop, but only express'd himself in general terms, that he should be one of this *Ecclesiastical Committee*, and then the nature of the thing it self would first limit his direct Power to *Constantinople* ; and that alone, we see gave him an Indirect Power over all other places. In short, He seems only to have design'd to Honour his own Court Bishop ; In the first place, by giving him the first place in the *Association*, but how far that would go, he left it to his own management, and what that was we very little know, because for want of Learning he was forc'd to leave it to *Cyrillus* a *Sicilian* Bishop, whom he kept with him as his guide and guardian. But notwithstanding that, it is certain that either through remissness or want of ability, things were ill enough manag'd, as appears by *Gregory Nazianzen's* Epistle to him, where

Sozom. lib.
7. cap. 10.

Inter Orat.
46.

wherein he complains of the wanton growth and encr ease of Heresies within his City, and exhorts him to obtain the Emperours Assistance for their effectual Suppression. But of the particular Actions of his Government, I find nothing recorded unless his attempt to depose *Gerontius* Bishop of *Nicomedia*, in the Province of *Bithynia*, but was repuls'd by the *Nicomedi-ans*; however we see by it how early the endeavours of the *Constantinopolitans* were after Usurpation.

Sozom. lib
8. cap. 6.

s. XXI. To him succeeds St. *Chryso-stom*, a very good man, but of a tart and eager Temper, as appears not only by the Character given of him by his own Historians, but by the tenor of his actions. I say nothing of his Quarel with the Court and his own Clergy, because that was within his own Jurisdiction; and though perhaps he might sometimes act with too much heat, yet I cannot see but that for the main, he behav'd himself as became an honest man, and one that made Conscience of his Duty and the faithful discharge of it. But as for his protecting the Rebellious *Monks* of *Ægypt* against the Canonical censure of their Bishop and Provincial Synod, and persisting in it after the Bishop had inform'd him of their Mu-

tinuous Behaviour, not only against himself, whom they had endeavour'd to Murder, but the Civil Magistrate, who was forc'd for the Peace of the Province to drive them into Banishment; it is such an overthrow of the Discipline of the Church, that no candor can excuse it. So that whatever were the merits of the Cause (and that of the *Monks* was bad enough) the Violation of the Canons of the Church was the thing with which *Theophilus* Bishop of *Alexandria* upbraided him, as *Palladius* himself, who is very Partial on St. *Chrysostom's* side in this story, tells it. *Arbitror te non ignorare quid præcipiant Concilii Nicæni Canones, Sancientes Episcopum non judicare causam extra Terminos suos. Si autem ignoras, disce & libellos contra me suscipere desine: nam etsi judicari me opus sit, ab Ægyptiis magis quam abs te id fieri oportet. qui Septuaginta dierum Itinere à nobis seperatus es.*

I suppose you are not ignorant of the Nicene Canon, which enacts that Bishops take not upon them to judge Causes out of their own Jurisdiction; but if you are ignorant of it, learn from me, and cease to receive accusations against me. For if I deserve any Censure the Bishops of Ægypt ought to inflict it, not you that live at the distance of seventy days journey from us.

This

This was smart and unanswerable ; It was a breach upon the whole Government of the *Christian Church*. For if another Bishop will receive such into Communion, as stand Excommunicate by their own Bishop, there is an end of all Ecclesiastical Discipline. And therefore that was the first and most sacred Rule in the Government of the ancient Church, not to admit any Person that liv'd under the Jurisdiction of another Bishop, into Communion without his Bishops Certificate. But to receive and patronise such as were Canonically proceeded against by their own Bishop, and that after information of their Sentence, as *St. Chrysostom* did, was in reality an Affront to the Government of all other Churches. For notwithstanding that *Theophilus* sent him a Copy of the Decree of the Council of *Alexandria*, and that *Epiphanius* attended upon him in Person, with another Decree of the Bishops of *Cyprus*, to take him off from this uncanonical Interposition, yet he would not desist, but took to himself the Power of Umpirage between the Bishop and his *Monks*; and would part with them upon no other terms than that the Bishop would yield to be reconcil'd to them by his Mediation. No wonder then that those good men *Theophilus* and *Epiphanius* resented this thing

thing with so much Severity. *Epiphanius*, when he was at *Constantinople*, would never so much as communicate with him, because when he had been before-hand advis'd by Letters from himself of the Sentence of the Council, he would not acquiesce in it. *Theophilus* being Summon'd by the Emperour, takes a journey to *Constantinople*, and joyns with him as many Bishops as he could take up by the way, with a resolution to depose *Chrysostom* in Council, for his Irregular proceedings; and when he came would not so much as see him; no nor as *St. Jerom* informs *Pope Innocent*, so much as lodge within the Walls of the City. *Baronius* and the Writers of the Church of *Rome*, blame *Theophilus* for the Vehemence of his proceedings against him, as too violently prosecuting a private pique. But all the ground of their concernment for *St. Chrysostom* was, because the *Pope* was on his side, otherwise it is but an uncharitable surmise to impute *Theophilus's* Zeal, in this matter to personal revenge. A Quarrel, I know, there was between them, and that perhaps might push him on with too much keenness: but had he not just cause enough to be very warm in this case, wherein the whole Discipline of the *Christian Church* lay at stake? For if what
St.

St. *Chrysostom* had done should pass uncontroll'd, it would put an end to the effectual Discipline of all other Churches in the World. *Theophilus* was as far as I can discern through the partiality of all the Historians against him, a good man, and mettlesom too, a great Assertor of Ecclesiastical Discipline, and a lover of true Peace and Unity. And therefore he cannot be blam'd for the hottest Opposition against such disorderly proceedings. But when St. *Chrysostom* was depos'd in the Council *Sub Quercu*, and his Interposition between *Theophilus* and his Clergy remov'd; *Theophilus* with a Fatherly tenderness invites the Offenders to Reconciliation, and upon Submission restores them to Communion, as *Sozomen* himself tells the Story. For he and all the Historians are very Partial in representing this Business on St. *Chrysostom's* side for the sake of *Origen*, against whom as they imagine, *Theophilus* made all this stir. But if we consider the whole matter Impartially, it will appear that the *Origenian* contest was least of *Theophilus* his concern, and that the main thing he labour'd in was the order of the Church. And therefore in the Synod under the *Oak*, in which St. *Chrysostom* was depos'd, he makes no mention (as *Sozomen* in the same place informes us) of

lib. 8. c. 17.

of *Origen's* Books, but only invites the *Monks* to repent of thir Schism , and upon their Repentance absolves them. And if the Acts of this Council, extant in *Photius*, may be believ'd (and I see very little ground to question them) the chief Article against St. *Chrysostom* was his invasi-
 on of other Provinces, and three Libels were prefer'd against him by three Bishops that he had depos'd, *Gerontius*, *Faustinus* and *Eugnomonius*. So that all *Theophilus* his Zeal against the *Origenists*, was no-
 thing else but a trick of subtilty, thereby to gain a party to himself, and without that assistance the Canons of the Church, though on his side, would scarce have
 born him up against the greatness of St. *Chrysostom* ; but the World being at that time divided about this controversie, and the *Anti-Origenists* being the prevailing
 Party , he by accusing his Schismatical *Monks* of *Origenism*, gain'd all the adverse party to his side, and particularly engaged
 the Zeal of *Epiphanius* and St. *Jerom* in his behalf, by whom, and that ruling reputation that they then had in the World,
 he was able to make head against the Power of St. *Chrysostom* , and at length break through it, though otherwise he
 was a great Student of *Origen's* Work both before and after this Controversie ; before
 he

he had like to have been Murdered for it by the *Anthropomorphites*, if he had not appeased them by his Wit; and afterwards it was objected to him, which he excused by pleading that there were many good flowers in him beside his Errours and Heresies. But that *Theophilus* had no such implacable unkindness to the Opinions of *Origen*, is evident from his intercourse and friendship with *Synesius*, who being inform'd of his own Nomination to a Bishoprick, to avoid it, he tells all the ill things that he can of himself; and among the rest, that he was an Irreclaimable Origenist, which he supposed was at that time the worst objection that he could contrive against himself. And whether this were only an artificial Fiction, as *Baronius* will have it, or his real Opinion, as it must be, because he declares it with a Protestation before God and his Holy Angels of its truth; it is all one, seeing the confession of it was not crime enough with *Theophilus* to deny him consecration, which he was so far from doing, that he was the chief man that pressed him to it; and though after he had ordein'd him, *Synesius* continued in his old Fondness to his Origenian Opinions, as is evident from divers of his Writings, especially his *Poems*; yet for all that there was an intimate
Friend-

Friendship and Familiarity kept up between him and *Theophilus* all his life time. Which plainly shews that he was in his heart no such Enemy to *Origen*, but only pretended so to be, thereby to gain a party to assist and bear him up against the greatness of St. *Chrysostom*. But if *Theophilus* may be condemn'd for using too much craft in the Origenian contest, and such counterfeittings, unless very prudent, are very suspicious and hardly to be excused; however that may be, I think it is evident enough, that *Theophilus* can never with any pretence of Law or Justice be blam'd for acting after so high a manner in another mans Jurisdiction; for he came not voluntarily to *Constantinople*, but was forc'd thither by the Emperours Edict to answer the Articles of Accusation, that were there preferred against him by his own disobedient Clergy. And therefore knowing his own Innocence and the Justice of his Cause, when he came, he would not appear as a guilty Person, but boldly asserts the Rights of the *Christian Church*; and instead of answering before St. *Chrysostom* and the Court Bishops, for any thing that had passed between himself and his own Clergy; he protests as well as he could, against all their Illegal proceedings, and declares St. *Chrysostom* unworthy of his

his Episcopal trust, by having stretch'd it to the Injury of all other *Christian Bishops* as well as himself. So that it is none of *Theophilus* his fault, that he ever appeared at *Constantinople*, but when he came it was his Duty to assert the Rights and Liberties of the *Catholick Church*. And this he could not do without censuring *St. Chrysostom*, who had so rashly Invaded other Provinces as well as *Ægypt*, taking upon him to ordain and depose Bishops every where, without regard to the distinction of Provinces and Limitation of Churches. Ordeining fifteen Bishops in *Asia*, and Deposing thirteen, choosing the Metropolitan of *Ephesus*, and thrusting his own Deacon into the Government of that Church; in short he took upon him to reform all other Churches as well as his own of *Constantinople*, as *Theodore* informs us; the Diocess of *Thrace*, and it's six Provinces, all *Asia*, and its eleven Provinces, and *Pontus* that hath as many Provinces as *Asia*. In *Pontus* he deposed *Gerontius* their Metropolitan, in *Thrace* he ordein'd *Serapion* Bishop of *Heraclea*, that was his own Metropolitan. Now these and the like actions could not but be very offensive to the rest of the World; so that as the Historians tell us, both the *Eastern* and *Western* Bishops were displeased with him, and

no

Soc. l. 6. c.
10. Soc. l.
8. c. 6.

lib. 5. c. 18.

nō wonder, when it was the common cause of all, and that was the real state of his case, the Authority of the See of *Constantinople* set up against and over the *Catholick* Church.

The Learned *Petrus de Marca* hath pleaded several things in his excuse, first, For his acting in *Asia* and *Ephesus*, he pleads the Necessity of the thing, and the sad degeneracy of that Church. And this I will allow to be true; but yet all corruptions are to be redressed in a regular way, otherwise instead of reforming Churches, we do but destroy them, and therefore he might have done his Duty towards the Reformation of these Churches, as the Canons had prescrib'd, by Letters to the Synod of the Province to reform themselves, by inciting other Bishops to joyn with him in the same work, by disowning Communion with them till they had remov'd abuses out of their Churches. This was all the Authority, that the Bishops of one Province had over the Bishops of another, and by this means was the Unity and Communion of the *Catholick* Church for a long time admirably preserv'd. But for a private Bishop to take upon him to ride his Circuit through other Provinces, and where ever he came, to ordein, depose, Institute, and reform
with

with an high hand, was such an Irregularity as no Necessity can excuse, or warrant.

In the next place it is pleaded that he acted as honorary Exarch over the Diocesses of *Pontus*, *Asia*, and *Thrace*, as he was made by the Council of *Constantinople*, that plac'd him next to *Rome*. But this honorary dignity gave him no Jurisdiction over his Neighbours, and therefore if by vertue of that he challeng'd any, it is plain that he usurp'd it. Then says *Petrus de Marca*, Is there nothing to excuse a man, so much own'd and Patroniz'd by the Church of *Rome*, that they restor'd him into the Dypticks of the Church? Truly I am sorry there is not, because as I seriously believe him to have been a very good man, so I take him to have been one of greatest Wits of the *Christian Church*. And perhaps the greatness of his Wit may be his best Apology, for that is always accompanied with too much warmth and vehemence of Temper, and this joyned with stiff honesty might hurry him inconsiderately upon extraordinary and unwarrantable actions, and especially when his Zeal was exasperated by gross and notorious crimes, that might very easily transport him beyond due bounds. Besides which, there are two things that may

T

some

somewhat palliate and alleviate his fault. The first is, The custom of his See, that he himself began not these excursions over the Diocesses of *Asia*, *Pontus* and *Thrace*, but found *Constantinople* in Possession of them, not only since the Council of *Constantinople*, by the attempt of his Predecessor *Nectarius* to depose *Gerontius*, but before that by *Eudoxius* his ordeining the Metropolitan of *Nicomedia*; and men are too apt to make use of such Precedents for creating a right to themselves.

But the best Plea is the clause inserted in the second Canon of the Council of *Constantinople*, to explain and limit it, that when the Canon had first forbidden the Invasion of other Provinces, it adds: *Let not Bishops uncalled go beyond the Bounds of their Diocesses, either to ordain or to exercise any other Ecclesiastical Office.* So that by this clause if they are called they have liberty to go. And this Liberty *St. Chrysostom* might have taken upon complaints from several Bishops to him; for as he was the man of greatest Fame and Reputation in the Church at that time, so being Bishop of *Constantinople*, the Seat of the Court, whither Bishops from all parts often resorted; he could not but have frequent Appeals and Applications made to him, which through his great Zeal he might

might receive too eagerly , and so turn that Liberty which the Council had left for extraordinary cases into an ordinary Jurisdiction. And the truth of it is; when Laws allow such Reserves, if men are not very tender and cautious in using them, they defeat the Laws themselves, that provide peremptorily for all ordinary Cases, and leave no such Liberty for them, and therefore when men too commonly make use of it, as *St. Chrysostom* did, upon every complaint, they destroy the Design of the Law it self, as he did this; for whereas the design of the Canon was to restrain every Bishop within his own ordinary Jurisdiction, unless in one extraordinary case, he by making use of this extraordinary case too familiarly, plainly exercis'd an ordinary Jurisdiction in other mens Provinces. This I take to be the true State of *St. Chrysostom's* cause, and have represented it as fairly and as candidly as I could without wronging the Truth; and if in any thing I have made it worse than it is, I should much rejoyce to amend that fault; for among all the ancient Worthys of the Church, I know not any whose memory I more honour than *St. Chrysostom's*.

§. XXII, His next Successors were his two great Enemies, *Arsacius* and *Atticus*, who manag'd the Accusation against him in the Synod *Sub Quercu*; *Arsacius* was Brother to *Nectarius*, and prefer'd only for his sake, being a decrepit old man, above eighty years of Age when he was chosen, and liv'd not above a year and two months after it; so that we have little more recorded of him, than that besides his great Age, he was more unqualified than his Brother for the Episcopal Trust, both to his Parts and Learning. To him succeeds *Atticus*, a man (says *Socrates*) rather Politick than Learned, a Character that he made good by the course of his following Actions: For being warn'd by *St. Chrysostom's* troubles, and finding that it was impossible to bear up (which if any man, *St. Chrysostom* would have done) against the united opposition of all other Bishops; he takes another course, and fortifies himself with the Emperours Authority, procures Laws and Edicts to Authorise his Usurpation, and if we believe *Balladius*, when *Pope Innocent* Excommunicated him, and the People refus'd to communicate with him, he obtain'd an Edict from the Emperour *Arcadius*, commanding them to it under pain of

of Excommunication and Confiscation of Goods. But as for his Foreign Invasions, *Lib. 7. c. 28.* *Socrates* tells us of a Law of his own procurement, though the occasion of mentioning it happen'd not till the time of his Successor *Sicinnius*, who undertaking to constitute *Proclus* Arch-Bishop of *Cyzicum* in the Province of *Hellefpont*, the *Cyzece-nians* (says the Historian) refuse his Bishop and choose one of his own; And that notwithstanding that Law that enacts that *no Bishop be appointed without the Consent and Authority of the Bishop of Constantinople*; pleading for themselves that the Law related only to the Person of *Atticus*, and therefore expiring with him, ought to be of no force in the case of his Successors. So that it is plain that such a Law there was, though he tells us not when, or by whom enacted (though it could be made by none but *Theodosius* the younger) neither how far it extended, whether to other Provinces, or only to *Cyzicum*, because that was the first and indeed the only Precedent of their Usurpation before the Council of *Constantinople*; and therefore if that were but once ratified by Law, that alone would give Authority to all the other Usurpations, that follow'd its Example. But the most subtle and artificial Law was that, which

concerns the Diocess of *Illyricum*, whereby all ancient both Customs and Canons are confirm'd, but yet so that if any controversie should arise, it is to be determined by the *Sacerdotal* Convention, but not without the Assent of the Bishop of *Constantinople*. Here first the Confirmation of all ancient Canons was plausible, but the thing aim'd at was under that pretence to slur in the Confirmation of Customs too, for by this time they pleaded prescriptions for their Usurpations. But 'tis still more pleasant to make the Bishop of *Constantinople* Supreme Judge in those Cases, in which himself was the only guilty Party; so that the design of the Law was only to empower him to abet himself in all his Usurpations. But the most pleasant of all is, not only to justify Illegal Customs by Laws that contradict them, and to make the Chief Offender against the Law, chief Judge of the Legality of the Custom, but under pretext of ancient custom to bring in meer Innovations. For though the Bishops of *Constantinople* had for some time Usurp'd some Authority in the *Eastern* Diocesses, yet till this time they never challeng'd any in the *Western*; but by virtue of this Law, they hoped under-hand to gain it, though we do not find that ever it took effect;

And

And it is probable that this was the first beginning of the open Breach between *Rome* and *Constantinople* concerning the Bounds of Jurisdiction ; which as it was a great Controversie in after-Ages, *Illyricum* being the middle bound of both Empires, and *Theodosius* the Great having not long before laid the *Eastern Illyricum* to the *Eastern* Empire, whereas all *Illyricum* had till that time belong'd to the *Western* ; his Son, it seems, thought it convenient to have *Ecclesiastical Jurisdiction* follow it, and that probably by the Instigation and Ambition of *Atticus*. But what effect it took is not certain, unless it be that the two *Prelates*, that were by this time setting up for Supremacy in each Empire, engag'd the two Emperours in the contest ; *Honorius* the *Western* Emperour upon the Bishop of *Rome*'s complaint writes to *Theodosius* to withdraw the Edict ; *Theodosius* promises to refer it to the Examination of his *Præfectus Prætorio* ; but what was done in it we know not, probably nothing at all, for it was ever after upon any advantage on either side brought into debate, though for the most part the Bishop of *Rome* was at the last in this, as he was in all other controversies, Victor. But the after-contests about it relate not to my present Enquiry, which is to find

*Holsten Col-
lect Rom. p.
81. dyc.
Now inser-
ted into the
Concil. max.*

out the beginnings of *Ecclesiastical Usurpation*; and especially in the See of *Constantinople*, and here more particularly by *Atticus*.

But though the *Constantinopolitans* could not prevail in the *West*, yet they kept their ground in the *East*. Of *Sisinnius* who was immediate Successor to *Atticus*, and his invading the Metropolis of *Cyzicum*, we have ipoken already. To him succeeds *Nestorius* a man of that fiery Temper, that had he not shortned his Reign, like *Nero*, by his own folly and fury, would no doubt have set all the Christian World on fire, as he did *Constantinople* at his very *Consecration*, whence he was ever after commonly called the *Incendiary*. But he had work enough to defend himself and his new *Metaphysicks*, and was in a little time deposed by the Council of *Ephesus*. Neither is there any thing material recorded of *Maximianus* who succeeded, probably because of the short time of his sitting. *Proclus* is next whose management of matters in the case of *Bassianus* and *Stephanus*, and divers other Metropolitans, is more remarkable than all the rest, and was indeed the very Settlement of their Usurpation; but because this whole cause was canvassed in the Council of *Calcedon*, and was withall the first thing that gave

gave occasion of debating the Rights of *Constantinople* in that Council; I shall refer its enquiry thither, which follow'd but a short time after under *Anatolius*, who succeeded him after *Flavianus*, and who with his Clergy defended the Prerogatives of the Church of *Constantinople* in the Council.

But having given this Compendious Historical Account of the Usurpations of that See, between the time of the Council of *Constantinople*, who only honour'd it with a Complement, and this of *Calcedon*, who improv'd an empty Title into great Eminence of Power; before I proceed any farther, it will be convenient to examine a little what was done in other Churches of the same kind, either by the Example of *Constantinople*, or rather by their advancement in the State of the Empire. For it is certain that the first breach that was made upon the ancient and Apostolick Liberties of the Church, was occasion'd by the raising of some Metropoles above others in the new constitution of the Empire. The Bishops that resided in the great Cities, that govern'd all the Metropolitan Cities of the Diocess, taking state upon themselves from the greatness and dignity of their Sees, and probably had for that reason a Preheminence of Place
and

and Respect given them ; for we find several of them in a settled possession of honour and precedency at the time of the Council of *Calcedon* , where were eight of them present, that in every Action are reckon'd before the rest and subscribe in the first place, *Rome, Constantinople, Alexandria, Antioch, Jerusalem, Heraclea, Cæsarea, Ephesus*, that were all Diocesan Cities in the civil division of the Empire ; and so had by custom it seems gain'd some honour of precedency. But nothing more ; for the Subscriptions to this, as well as all other Councils are made according to the Ancient Division of the Empire into Provinces, not after the new model by Diocesses. And though the Bishop of the Diocesan City subscribes first, yet he only subscribes as the Metropolitan of his own Province ; and in the first place, because first Metropolitan within the Diocess. Though this they would not be content with, without some Supremacy of Power, as is evident from all the forementioned Canons , made on purpose to beat back their several Attempts of Usurpation. But they persisting in their Pretences, not only of higher Privileges, but greater Power than other Churches, at last obtain'd it in the Council of *Calcedon*, out of meer complement and flattery to the Throne of *Con-*
stan-

stantinople, for whose sake it was that all the other were advanced with no kindness to themselves ; for that being but a private Bishoprick , it had been too invidious a thing to advance it to so great a heighth, had it not seem'd to give some kind of Equality to those great Churches that could challenge some Title to Prerogative ; and therefore the Council gives them a Superiority of Power over Metropolitans within their own Diocess meerly to countenance that *Universality of Jurisdiction*, that it gave to the See of *Constantinople*, Canon 19th. *If any Clerke have a controversie with another Clerke, he is to complain to his own Bishop, and not the Secular Courts ; if a controversie with his Bishop, to the Synod of the Province ; if with his Metropolitan, to the Exarch of the Diocess, or the Throne of the Imperial City of Constantinople.* The word *ἑξαρχος* signifies any kind of Supreme Authority, and so we find in the Council of *Sardica* the *Exarch* of the Province used as *Synonymous* with the Bishop of the Metropolis or the head Bishop of the Province. But because it was a kind of Secular word, and was by custom appropriated to the *Vicarii* of Diocesses, it was thought too Lordly by the wise *African* Bishops, who were of all others the most watchful against the Encroach-

croachments of Ambition. And therefore
 they decreed in the 42. Canon of the *Afri-
 can Code*, that no Metropolitan shall be
 stiled *Exarch*, but only Bishop of the *first
 See*. Which they did, say the *Scholiasts*,
Balsamon and *Zonaras*, to prevent Pride
 and Arrogance in the Church; and I do
 not know that it is any where but in the
 Council of *Sardica* given to Metropoli-
 tans. And the first time that we meet with
 the *Exarch* of a Diocess is in the Council
 of *Calcedon*; and therefore it is a mistake
 without bottom in *Petrus de Marca*, to
 affirm that this Title is used by the Coun-
 cil of *Constantinople*; there indeed we meet
 with such a thing as a Diocess, but not an
Exarch; and the word Diocess is used as a
 term of Art in the State, rather than in the
 Church, and signifies only the Metropoli-
 tan of that City, that is made the Diocessan
 City in the new division of the Em-
 pire, excluding all Superiority over the
 other Metropolitans of the same Diocess.
 For the Canon expressly vouches the Su-
 premacy of every Metropolitan. So that
 the meaning of the *Constantinopolitan* Canon
 is only and plainly this, that whereas by
 the Decree of the Council of *Nice*, the
 Metropolitan had Supreme Jurisdiction
 within his own Province; yet notwith-
 standing that these Bishops of the new
 Dio-

Lib. 1. cap.
 3. §. 5.

Diocesan Cities grew so exorbitant as to take upon them Authority in other Churches, even beyond the Bounds of their own civil Diocess ; therefore the Council severely checks this new kind of Insolence. And that being restrain'd, it immediately adds, *That the Supreme right of Metropolitans is sufficiently secured by the Council of Nice.* As if they should have said, we need take no care for that which is already so well settled ; our present business is to restrain this new exorbitance of the Diocesan Cities. And therefore it is observable that the Canon is particularly made for the five Diocesses under the *Præfectus Prætorio* of the *East* ; the *East* peculiarly so called, *Ægypt, Asia, Pontus and Thrace*, as they are there reckoned up : But as in that Council we first meet with the Term *Diocess*, as distinctly denoting many Provinces according to the new civil Division of the Empire ; So in the fourth Council held at *Calcedon*, do we first find the Settlement of the *Ecclesiastical Exarch* of these Diocesses, as set up above Metropolitans.

§. XXIII. For matters having been long prepared by so many several Attempts of Usurpation, though they were still in general condemn'd by Councils, yet many
par-

particulars took effect and pass'd uncontroll'd, and then they became Precedents to Authorise the same Irregularities for the time to come. But especially *Constantinople*, being somewhat countenanced (as they Impudently pretended) by this very Canon of *Constantinople*, and having the most ancient prescription in this kind; but chiefly the bold and open practice of St. *Chrysostom*, who was now the Favorite of the Church of *Rome*, from whom alone the *Constantinopolitans* fear'd any Opposition; they thought all things ripe for the full accomplishment and legal Settlement of their Usurpation. And this was the chief design at the bottom in calling the great Council of *Calcedon*; and though it came upon the Stage last of all, and was brought in very obliquely, yet both parties seem to have come particularly prepar'd for this Combate; and upon every slight occasion have their hands upon their Swords ready to draw. The first breaking out of the Quarrel was from the Contest between *Bassianus* and *Stephanus* for the Bishoprick of *Ephesus*, to which neither of them being Canonically ordein'd, the Council Depose them both; and then the Question is abruptly enough started, where the new Bishop should be Consecrated, at *Constantinople* or *Ephesus*? Upon this
this

this the Council is immediately in an uproar, the Judges refer it to the Bishops, where the Bishop of *Ephesus* ought to be regularly ordein'd according to the Canons? They all Answer within his own Province, and this *Leontius* Bishop of *Magnesia*, proves over and above by the Universal practice of that Church, down from *St. Timothy* its first Bishop. This immediately gives fire to the *Constantinopolitans*; and though they durst not appear whilst the Cause was referr'd to the Canons, yet the word *Custom* was no sooner mention'd, than they all Discharge. *Philip* a Presbyter of that Church contradicts it with the Practice of *St. Chrysostom*, who Depos'd fifteen Bishops in *Asia*, and ordein'd others in their stead; and among the rest *Memnon* was ordein'd at *Constantinople*. *Actius* the Arch-Deacon of *Constantinople* alledges the Precedents of *Castinus*, *Heraclides* and *Basilus* Bishops of *Ephesus*, and all ordain'd at *Constantinople*. To which the Bishops cry out οἱ κανόνες κρατεῖτωσαν. Let the Canons prevail. And the *Constantinopolitans* answer; Yes let them, but let not the Privileges of the Church of *Constantinople* be impair'd, and let our Arch-Bishop ordein according to Custom. Here the disingenuity of the *Constantinopolitans* is notorious, not only to set up custom against the *Nicene* Canons,

Canons, for if it were against them, that alone must prove it illegal, but to prescribe a Custom from so few Precedents; for *St. Chrysostom's* deposing fifteen Bishops in *Asia*, as *Philippus* pleads, was nothing to the purpose, for his ordaining Bishops at *Constantinople*, when he did it not at *Constantinople*, but in the Province of *Asia*; But *Aetius* his Plea of custom from the Instance of *Basilus* is very Impudent, when he was inform'd just before by *Leontius*, that this was done by force, against the will of the *Asian* Churches, and with great Tumults and Disorders; and yet from this violent and irregular action, which they were forc'd to maintain by the Emperours Authority, he does not blush to insist upon the Plea of Prescription. But the Judges finding the debate so warm and the Arguments of the *Constantinopolitans* so weak, adjourn the Council to the next day, in which nothing was treated of but the Cause of *Bassianus* and *Stephanus*. So that that opportunity being lost, the next Action of the Council was taken up with the Controversie between *Eunomius* Bishop of *Nicomedia*, and *Anastasius* Bishop of *Nice*; *Nicomedia* was the ancient Metropolis of *Bythmia*, and so the Bishop of it had Jurisdiction over the whole Province; but *Nice* having been lately made

a Metropolitan City by the Emperour ; the Bishop of it thereupon took upon him Metropolitcal Authority in some part of the Province, especially in the Bishoprick of *Basilonopolis* ; of this *Eunomius* makes complaint to the Council, who upon perusal of the Canons, and the Emperours Letter of Grant, to *Nice*, determine (as was usual in such cases) that according to the ancient Canons, the Bishop of *Nicomedia* shall enjoy the Metropolitcal Authority of the Province ; and the Bishop of *Nice* , in obedience to the Emperours grant, Metropolitcal honour, but so as to be Subject to his Metropolitan as well as the other Bishops of the Province. This one would think remote enough from the Cause of *Constantinople* , yet here *Ætius* is not able to hold ; but enters his Protestation that this Judgement should be no Prejudice to the See of *Constantinople*, that had Power to ordein in *Basilonopolis* and other Places. So that hereby the Bishops of *Constantinople* had a Right to ordein not only Metropolitans, but inferior Bishops, and so this mans Confidence improves in every Action. But here it rais'd the Choler and indignation of the Bishops , and renews their former Cry , *to the Canons, to the Canons*, and that causes the adjournment of the Council.

The next Action's taken up with the cause of *Domnus* Bishop of *Antioch*, and *Athanasius* Bishop of *Perrha*, who being accus'd of great Crimes ; *Domnus* refers the hearing of the Cause to his Friend *Panolbius* , and yet *Athanasius* declines the Judgement, refuses to appear, and resigns his Bishoprick. And after all this repairs to *Constantinople*, tells a strange Story to *Proclus* and *Cyrillus*, who embrace his appeal, especially *Proclus* , and write to *Domnus* in his behalf, wherein among other things *Proclus* desires him not to take it ill as an injury offer'd to the See of *Antioch*, that his Bishop should take refuge at *Constantinople*, but that he did it to avoid the Tumult and Sedition of the People ; and therefore begg'd the Intercession of *Proclus* and his Brother *Cyril*, as the most modest and peaceable way to reconcile himself to his Metropolitan. Arm'd with these Letters , he returns home , throws out *Sabinianus* , that was chosen into his Place, and resumes his Bishoprick, of which *Sabinianus* making his Complaint to the Council, they depose *Athanasius* and restore him. Here we may see how ready the *Constantinopolitans* were to embrace and encourage such Fugitives ; but above all the rest *Proclus* was most forward in these Irregularities , and made the

the boldest Precedents. It was he that ordain'd *Basilus* Bishop of *Ephesus* at *Constantinople* in spite of the Bishops of the Province; it was he that Protected *Bassianus*, both against the Canons and his Provincial Synod; and it is he that undertakes the fowl Cause of *Athanasus*, in appealing from his Metropolitan, and without making due Enquiry into the Merits of it, right or wrong interposes for his Re-stitution.

And now we come to the 15th. Action in which the Canons of this Council are pass'd; and here the *Constantinopolitans* seem to have been too subtile for the *Romanists*, for though they were both upon their Guard, yet the *Popes Legates*, I know not by what Inadvertency, voted with them, till they came to the twenty eighth Canon, which gave the Bishop of *Constantinople* a strange kind of new Exorbitant Power. But before that, they had in effect given him as much as that demanded; for in the forementioned ninth Canon, it is enacted, That the last Appeal from the Metropolitan of the Province, is to be made either to the *Exarch* of the Diocess, or the Bishop of *Constantinople*. The design of this is plain enough, the *Exarch's* or Bishops of the Diocesan Cities were to be gratified in their Ambition of gaining a Superiority

ority over the Metropolitans of the Diocess, and that was enough to oblige those great Prelates, that drew the rest after them to a forward compliance, for any thing that would gratifie the *Constantinopolitan* Clergy, that were the grand Contrivers of this Canon. And that was so order'd as at the same time, that it gave them their Power, it took it away, and settled it all on the Bishop of *Constantinople*, for whereas their Power was limited to their own Diocesses, his was Universal and unlimited; and that engross'd all their Powers in his own hands. For where several Liberties of Appeal are granted, if one be greater than another, as all Persons naturally resort to that, so that as naturally takes all Appeals from the other Courts into its own Jurisdiction, and makes it self Superior Judge of their Proceedings, and last head of all Appeals from them to it self. This was well contriv'd for the Supremacy of their own See; but it is better rivetted in the seventeenth Canon, where it is decreed, that all Controversies about Bounds of Jurisdiction, shall be referr'd to the Synod of the Province, and determin'd by thirty years Prescription; but if the Custom be within the last thirty years, the Appeal may be made to the *Exarch* of the Diocess, or the Bishop of

Con-

Constantinople. And hereby they made themselves Judges of the Legality of their own Proceedings. For as for the Actions of *St. Chrysostom*, they had been already justified to some purpose by the Church of *Rome*, and therefore they were secure of their allowance; and as for *Proclus's* transgressions, that they pleaded as their main Precedents, they were within less than the Compass of thirty years; for he sat in the Throne twelve years and odd months; dyed in the year 446. whereas the Council was conven'd in the year 451. So that by this Cannon they took the last Supreme Appeal, concerning all Irregular Actions to themselves; and when they had made themselves their own Judges, we may be sure that they would not fail to be their own Advocates, and take care of their own Cause. Thus far the Council and the Legates went lovingly together; but the *Constantinopolitans* having gain'd this Advantage to Authorise their own Innovations; they immediately sweep the three great Diocesses of *Asia*, *Pontus* and *Thrace* into their own Jurisdiction, because they knew they had thirty years Prescription for their Usurpations there. But this was pass'd by stealth, and in the absence not only of the *Legates*, but in the absence of the *Exarch* of *Pontus*, and the vacancy of

Ephesus, that were the chief Persons concern'd; and by the Votes of not above two hundred Bishops, that were not above the third part of the Council. Of this the *Legates* next day make grievous Complaint; But *Aetius* answers as to their Absence, that they absented themselves, and that they were acquaintd with the business, but refused to act, as being beyond their Commission. And to their Objection of the Canon of *Nice*, for the Supreme Power of Metropolitans in their Province, that was here destroy'd, he opposes after his usual Rate of Impudence the second Canon of the Council of *Constantinople*, for the honorary precedency of that City next to *Rome*. As for the Pretence of Compulsion, the Bishops of *Asia* and *Pontus*, that were most concern'd (for *Thrace* was already devour'd) declare the freedom of their Vote and Subscription. The other Bishops that had not Subscribed, being ask'd their Opinion, were for the most part silent, only *Eusebius* Bishop of *Ancyra* asserts the right of his Province of *Galatia*, and complains of the late invasion of *Proclus*, in ordeining the Bishop of *Gangra* within his Province. But here he is school'd by *Anatolius*, and call'd to give an Account of his own Ordination; to which he confesses, that himself

was

was ordein'd by *Proclus*, Upon this *Thalassius* Metropolitan of *Pontus*, and so the Person most concern'd, having been an old Courtier, and seeing which way the Court drove, submits himself to the Bishop of *Constantinople*; the Judges sies his complement, and without any farther Ceremony, Subject the Diocesses of *Thrace*, *Asia* and *Pontus* to his Jurisdiction, and so (the *Legates* having only time to protest against it) break up the Council. And thus is this new Power instituted over Metropolitans, that had hitherto held their Original Supremacy in the Church; for whereas they were not ordein'd but by the Synod of their own Province, nor Subject to any Authority out of it; now are the Metropolitans of *Thrace*, *Pontus* and *Asia* reduc'd under an Inferior Bishop, so as to be Subject to him and ordein'd by him. Though the Canon is piec'd together so awkerdly, as plainly shews the Impudence of its contrivers; they found it upon the Privileges granted by the Council of *Constantinople* to that See, which was nothing but Precedency of Honour; and yet by vertue of that they Subject *Thrace*, *Asia*, and *Pontus* to its Jurisdiction; notwithstanding that the same Council at the same time, had secur'd their Government to their own Me-

ropolitans; so that the sence of the Canon was plainly this, forasmuch as the Council of *Constantinople* hath ordein'd, that *Thrace*, *Pontus* and *Asia*, shall be govern'd by the Metropolitans of *Heraclea*, *Cæsarea*, and *Ephesus*, and none other; in pursuance thereof we ordein that both they and their Metropolitans shall be Subject to the Bishop of *Constantinople*.

§. XXIV. But all this is only the opening of War, and setting up the Standard of Usurpation, for at the News hereof the great *Pope Leo* is alarm'd, as seeing himself like to be overtop'd by *Constantinople*, having so large a Jurisdiction laid to its Authority; a Power which himself and Predecessors had never directly pretended to. But that he might not be surpris'd, the Council it self takes care to acquaint him with their Proceedings in a Synodical Epistle, in which they tell him, that they had confirm'd the Precedency of Honour to *Constantinople* next to *Rome*, because it had been settled upon it by the second general Council; and whereas there had been a Custom of a long standing for the Bishop of *Constantinople*, to ordein the Metropolitans of *Asia*, *Pontus* and *Thrace*, they had thought good to Establish it by a Synodical Decree, not that they design'd

Pag. 837.
damnamq;
consuetudi-
nem, &c.

to add any thing to the Throne of *Constantinople*, but only to provide for the Peace of the Churches, especially *Ephesus*, where had happen'd so many Tumults and Disorders in times of Vacancy; and to all this they say, they were induc'd because they knew it to be a thing very acceptable, not only to the most Christian Emperours themselves, but also to the Illustrious Senat, and to the whole Imperial City; and therefore desire his concurrence to so grateful a Work. But *Pope Leo* was wiser than to be put off with such rank Hypocrisie. and first he schools *Anatolius* himself, writes him a sharp Letter, lays all this Prevarication at his Door, twits him with his own scarce Canonical Ordination; and then with his presuming to Consecrate the Bishop of *Antioch*, and then tells him that he is sorry, that after these failings he should be so presumptuous as to infringe the *Nicene* Canons, by which the second Preeminence of Honour is settled upon the See of *Alexandria*, and the third upon *Antioch*; and yet notwithstanding that, he should place himself about them, and deprive all other Metropolitans of their just Honour; for which unheard of Attempts, he abuses the Authority of the Council, that was only call'd to extinguish, not to abet Ambition:

on: But all in vain, for nothing can ever take effect, that is contrary to the *Nicene* Canons, that are receiv'd through the whole world, and are to continue in force to the end of it; and therefore he requires him to desist from these Attempts for the time to come, and not upon frivolous Pretences, to destroy the Right of Provinces, and the ancient Privileges of Metropolitans, not to rob St. *Mark's* See of *Alexandria*, and St. *Peter's* of *Antioch* of their Dignity; but if he have a mind to advance his own See, his best way to do it, is by being an Example to other Churches in Vertue and Humility, by which he will make himself greater than by all his ways of Ambition. And as for the Canon of *Constantinople*, that settles the second Place of Preheminence upon that See; he tells him that the Apostolick See was never acquainted with it, and that it was now too late to prop up such a tottering Title by forcing the shew of a Confirmation from the Council. And then deals plainly with the Emperour and Emperess, by acquainting them with the Insolency of *Anatolius*, and the Illegality of his Attempt to get Power over Metropolitans, declares his utmost Opposition, and threatens Peremptory Excommunication. And here the only thing he pretends to stand

stand upon, is the Authority of the Council of *Nice*, by which the Supremacy of Metropolitans within their Province is establish'd; this Rule he will by no means suffer to be violated, but will have it so Sacred and Unalterable, that it cannot be retrench'd by any Council how great so ever. And therefore he requires *Anatolius* to desist from this Ambition, with some severe suggestions if he doth not, and conjures the Emperour and Emperess not to suffer such an unwarrantable Innovation to be thrust upon the Church in their time, as they would not stein the Honour of their Reign. Then he takes the Council it self to task, and sends them too to School to the *Nicene* Council. After this *Epist.* 15. he incites *Maximus* Bishop of *Antioch*, to *Epist.* 17. maintain the Right of his See, as it stood settled by the Council of *Nice*, and not suffer himself, that was the third Bishop in the World, to be thrust down into the fourth place by the Pride and Ambition of *Constantinople*. At the roaring of this great Lyon (as *Baronius* wittily insults) they are all affrighted. The Emperour *Marcian* by Edict nulls his confirmation of the *Calcedon* Canon, as contrary to the *Nicene* Canons; and acknowledges all Edicts of Princes, that are inconsistent with them, not to be obligatory. *Anatolius* sub- *Leon Ep.* 7.

submits and transfers the fault from himself to his Clergy, and is hardly forgiven by the *Pope*, even at the Emperours Intercession. See (says *Baronius*) the Sovereign Power of the Pope over the Catholick Church, who alone was able to reverse and countermand the Decree of six hundred Bishops. But for this Complement *Pope Leo* is beholden to the Cardinal, for in his own Epistles, (though he was a stout and an Imperious *Pope*, and without doubt design'd the *Papal* Monarchy of the Apostolick See, as high as any of the whole Succession) he makes no such Pretence to any Sovereign Authority ; he claims no Power Superior to Metropolitans ; nay he expressly disclaims it as a Breach of the *Nicene* Canons, and that is the ground of his Remonstrance ; so that he here stands not upon his own Authority (as *Baronius* intimates) as if it were to overrule a general Council, but only upon the great Authority of the Council of *Nice*, in obedience to which he enters his Protestation against the Council of *Calcedon*, declaring they had Power to determin any Causes that were left undetermin'd by the *Nicene* Council ; and that he would not have concern'd himself about it, but whilst they so openly contradicted that, he for his part must declare to all the World that all

Canons

Canons and Laws contrary to the Decrees of *Nice*, are *ipso facto*, null and void. This in short is the plain substance of all his thundering Epistles about this matter.

And so he dying things rested a while during the Reign of *Marcian*, and the sitting of *Gennadius*, who succeeded *Anatolius* at *Constantinople*, and *Hilarius* who succeeded *Leo* at *Rome*. But the *Western* Empire being then invaded and overrun by the barbarous Nations, *Rome* it self twice taken by the *Goths*, and at that instant enslav'd by the *Hunns*, and the *Heruli*, and perpetually wasted with *Northern* Incurfions, and reduced into Subjection to Forreigners, and at best when they enjoyed any Liberty, were govern'd by a *Vice-Roy* from *Constantinople*; This *Acacius* a bold man, who succeeded next in that Throne, thought a convenient time to recover the grandeur of that See. And therefore obtains a Rescript from the Emperour *Leo*, to restore him to all the rights, Priviledges and Preeminences that any of his Predecessors ever enjoy'd, and to null all Laws made to the contrary.

Sacrosanctam quoque Religiosissimæ hujus Civitatis Ecclesiam & matrem nostræ pietatis, & Christianorum Orthodoxæ Religionis omnium, & ejusdem regię Urbis Sanctissimam

*Lib. I 6. De
Sacrosanct.
Ecclesi.*

sedem

sedem privilegia & honores omnes super Episcoporum creationibus, & jura ante alios residendi, & cætera omnia, quæ ante nostrum imperium, vel nobis imperantibus habuisse dignoscitur, habere in perpetuum firmiter regiae urbis intuitu judicamus & sancimus. This immediately nettles *Pope Simplicius*, and away he writes both to *Acacius* and the Emperour, rates them both for their disorderly actings, and requires them to desist from their Attempts. But all in vain, for the Emperour never revers'd his Edict, neither would *Acacius* yield to any of his demands. Only in the deposition of *Timotheus Ælurus* from *Alexandria*, he was pleas'd to gratifie the *Popes* Importunity, and no wonder, when he had been one of the boldest Assertors of the rights of the Church, against the *Constantinopolitan* Usurpation. The story in short is this: The Tyrant *Basiliscus* having put the Emperour *Zeno* to flight, and seisd the Empire, he calls back *Timotheus Ælurus* from Banishment, whom the Emperour *Leo* had Banish'd because of his restless Temper; but he returning to the Bishoprick of *Alexandria* procured circular Letters of the Tyrant to revoke all the Decrees of the Council of *Calcedon*, and though he did this chiefly for the sake of his Heresie, yet by this means he restor'd the dignity of his

Gulase. 11.

Evang. l. 3.

his own Church, and (as *Evagrius* records it) the Patriarchal right of *Ephesus*, which had been taken away by the Council of *Calcedon*, which though true, the Historian is somewhat mistaken, for *Ephesus* never actually enjoy'd a Patriarchal Right, *i. e.* a Power over Metropolitans ; but the meaning of the Historian is that it was restor'd to its ancient Liberty, which the Council had taken away by Subjecting it to the See of *Constantinople*; so that it was not restor'd to its own Patriarchal right, but was deliver'd from that of *Constantinople*. But a while after the Tyrant being distress'd by *Acacius* and his *Monks*, and hearing that *Zeno* was marching towards him with a great Army, to appease *Acacius*, he recants his former Ediſt to *Timotheus* *Ælurus*, and restores the Patriarchal right of *Constantinople* ; and then he being overcome, and *Zeno* restor'd to the Imperial Throne, *Acacius*, who was the chiefest instrument of his Restitution, easily obtains of him to condemn the Tyrants first Ediſt, and confirm'd the Patriarchal priviledges of the Royal City. And flush't with this Success and the Emperours deserved Favour ; he mounts above all Power in the Christian Church, places and displaces Arch-Bishops in the great Cities of *Alexandria* and *Antioch* at his plea-

pleasure. When he had depos'd *Calendion* at *Antioch*, he would never at all the *Popes* Importunity yeild to his Restitution : And when *John* the new chosen Bishop of *Alexandria* neglected to signifie his Election to him, he removes him by the Emperours Authority, and places *Petrus Moggus* in his stead. The *Pope* vehemently opposes it, but the Emperour at the Instigation of *Acacius*, sends his peremptory commands to the Prefect of *Ægypt*, to Banish *John* and instal *Peter* ; *John* flies to *Rome* and begs the *Popes* assistance for his restitution, who entertains his Suit , but dyes before he could effect it, and leaves it to his Successor *Fælix* , who receives from *John* Articles against *Acacius* , and writes to the Emperour to send him to *Rome* to clear himself in Council there ; but *Acacius* outwits his Legates , and draws them into Communicate publickly , not only with himself but *Peter Moggus*, and sends them back with smart Letters from the Emperour and himself against *John*, and Imprisons *Fælix* the *Popes* own Kinsman, because he refused to joyn in Communion with them. Upon this *Fælix* Deposes and Excommunicates not only his Legates, but *Acacius* and *Peter Moggus* , upon that *Acacius* fires, and as he had before Depos'd *Calendion* from the See of *Antioch* in spite of

Evag. l. 3.
Cap. 18. 21.

of *Simplicius* ; so now he puts *Petrus Fullo* that stood convicted of Heresie by the Apostolick See, in his stead, requites the *Pope* with his own Curtesie of Excommunication, and strikes his name out of the Dypticks of the Church. A second Council is call'd at *Rome*, and *Acacius* Excommunicated a second time, particularly for his Stubbornness against *Calendion*, and this is signified to the Emperour, the Clergy of *Constantinople*, and the *Eastern* Bishops. But *Acacius* a second time overcomes his Legate with Bribes, and makes him discover all the Plots and Designs at *Rome* against him, stands undauntedly to his cause; and not long after dyes the very *Thomas a Becket* of the Church of *Constantinople*, and his memory was so dear to the People of that City, that the Emperour *Anastafius* a good time after, to make himself popular to the *Constantinopolitans*, refused to have his name expung'd out of the Dypticks, at the Importunity of *Pope Hormisdas* for this very reason, lest it might raise a Tumult among the People, who honoured his name above all others.

§. XXV. But though he was dead, the Controversie dyes not with him; *Phrasiac* succeeds, to whom *Pope Fælix* refuses

Epist. 130

Liberatus
cap. 18.

communion, till the name of *Acacius* be expung'd; but before the Controversie came to any head, or indeed that he receiv'd the *Popes* Letter, *Phranitas* dyes within four months after his Election. To him succeeds *Euphemius* an Orthodox Bishop, he restores *Fælix* his name to the Dypticks; but because he would not expunge *Acacius*, *Fælix* admits him not to Communion; and writing a Congratulatory Letter to the Emperour *Zeno*, for the choice of so good a Bishop, he tells him that this is the only thing that remain'd to perfect his Reformation; and then writes to *Thalassius*, Prior of the Monks of *Constantinople*, and *Vetranio* the Deposed Bishop of *Antioch*, not to Communicate with the Church of *Constantinople*, till the name of *Acacius* was expung'd, and that they had leave from the Apostolical See. And that Plea is very observable in his and *Leo's* Letters; many strictures there are of it in the other *Popes* from the time of *Innocent* the first, but these finding themselves over power'd by the Court of *Constantinople*, leave the Plea of Primacy from the dignity of their City, and the Vote of the Council of *Nice*, and insist upon nothing but the honour of *St. Peter*, and the Authority of the Apostolick See, to bear up against the greatness of *Constantinople*,
and

and the favour of the Emperours to their Imperial City ; and by the Confidence of this new Plea bore them down, opposing the name of *St. Peter*, to what ever the Emperours Enacted ; and at last this *Pope* made a Decree, that in Ecclesiastical mat- Gratian
ters the Priestly Authority ought to over- dist. 10.
rule the Imperial, knowing that if that were cut off from the See of *Constantinople*, he could easily over-top all its pretences, that was t'other day but a private Bishoprick by Ecclesiastical Law and Prescription. And as he raised this Pretence so high, none of his Successors would ever abate it ; *Gelasius* a stiff man that follow'd next, refuses all Communion with *Euphemius* of *Constantinople*, till *Acacius* is expung'd ; the pretence of all which wrath was his Compliance with the *Eutychians* in his latter days ; but the first Quarrel was his Ambition to over-top *Rome*, and therefore the *Romanists* resolv'd never to let the business fall till they had blasted his name and memory, that had been their boldest and most dangerous Adversary ; and that is the thing insisted upon in all *Galasius's* Epistles to the Oriental Churches, that *Acacius* is never to be forgiven, as dying in open Rebellion to the Authority of the Apostolical See ; which alone as he tells the Bishops of *Dardania* in his

Council
Max. Vol.
4. p. 1227.

13th. Epistle, is sufficient to warrant his Condemnation. And therefore to prevent mistakes and Objections (that probably were made at that time) he Publishes his Manifesto, that the Council of *Calcedon* was not sufficient to justify his Proceedings; and that though that had given him so great Authority, yet that being contradicted by the Apostolical See, was in it self void, the Acts of Councils having no force or validity without the Confirmation of the Apostolical See. And so came out the meaning of their Zeal against *Acacius*; the Cry was his Compliance with the *Eutychians*. But, I pray why is that a Crime? Because condemn'd by the Council of *Calcedon*, for either (as *Galasius* begins his Manifesto) *Ne fortè, quod solent, dicant, &c. But if it be said, as it commonly is, that if we admit the Council of Calcedon, all its Decrees are to be equally admitted, but if we admit not all, we lose the Authority of every part, and then what becomes of your out-cry against the Eutychians and Nestorians by virtue of that Council?* To this he replies, Let the world know that what the Apostolical See confirm'd, was good and valid, and ought to be receiv'd of the *Catholick Church*, but if there were any thing there treated of and determined, that the Apostolical

stolical See dislik'd, it was null and void. And thus he boldly gain'd his Point, when the Council of *Calcedon* was set against it self in the Cause of *Acacius*, to distinguish between what was and was not allowed by the Apostolical See; for so the cause was carried both against the *Eutychians* and the Bishops of *Constantinople*, for the first they pass'd, and the last they disavow'd. So that the Authority of this Council was at last cast upon the Bishop of *Rome*; and so far as he was pleased to allow it, it was valid, but if not, it was against the Tradition of the *Catholic Church*. And to shew the great Authority of the Apostolick See, he takes upon him in a private Synod of his own, to Confirm or reprobate any ancient Council or Doctor of the Church, by virtue of his own Decree. For he doth not pretend to be guided by the Tradition of the Church, but only to make use of *St. Peters Primacy*: for so he begins his Decree; *Sancta Romana Catholica & Apostolica Ecclesia nullis Synodicis constitutis cæteris Ecclesiis prelatæ est, sed Evangelicâ voce Domini & Salvatoris nostri primatum obtinuit, Tu es Petrus, inquit; And upon this, pretends to pass his Judgement at Random, but with full Apostolical Authority, and hath to shew his Judgement, rejected most of*

the best writers of the Christian Church, and admitted great numbers of others, both counterfeit and fabulous, and that may pass among the other Proofs of his Infallibility; though in those days they were not come to that Degree of Confidence; But however here is *St. Peter's Primacy* with a witness, not by Ecclesiastical Custom or Constitution, but by Divine Right, and that over the *Catholick Church*; for so he expressly affirms in the Preface of his Decree. Here is Primacy or Precedency by Custom turn'd, First into Divine Right: Secondly into Authority; whereas before the Quarrel with *Constantinople*, no Bishop of *Rome* ever pretended to any Power in another Province; but now the Bishop of *Constantinople* aims to mount above him by assuming equal dignity, much greater Authority and larger extent of Jurisdiction, he is resolv'd to out-bid him, and no less Diocess will content him than the whole *Catholick Church*. And thus was the Supremacy of the Church of *Rome* founded meerly upon the Ambition of the Church of *Constantinople*. *Galasius* having thus laid the foundation of the *Papal Empire*, he dyes, and *Anastasius* succeeding in his stead, the first Act of his Reign is to dispatch his Mandate to *Anastasius* the Emperour, demanding Justice upon the name of *Aca-*
cius,

cious, and requiring his obedience to the Apostolick See, and having thus made his Protestation, he dyed. *

And though his Successor *Pope Symmachus* had work enough to defend himself against *Theodorick* an *Arrian* King, and the Accusations of some of the great men at *Rome*, and continual Domestick Disturbances, yet he will not let this Controversie fall; and in pursuit of it Excommunicates the Emperour *Anastasius*; upon which the Emperour writes an Inve-

ctive against him; in answer to which, *Symmachus* writes a brisk Apologetick, from which it appears that one of the great Articles of their Contest was about Communicating with the name of *Acacius*, i. e. keeping it in, or blotting it out of the Dypticks. And then having bound up the Emperour, he writes to the Oriental Bishops, to submit themselves to the Apostolical See, under pain of Excommunication. *Quia si ab eorum, quos Apostolica sedes damnavit, non se societate remove- rint, sciant nullo colore, nullo figmento, nulla- que calliditate Ecclesiasticæ se custodiæ posse Subrepere.* The Bishops at least some them being scar'd either with his bold

* Though *Gratian*, notwithstanding he quotes the very Epistle in which *Anastasius* requires of the Emperour to Expunge the name of *Acacius* out of the Dypticks, is so blind as to tell us, that he was struck by the Judgement of God, because he endeavour'd his Restitution. *Quia voluit occultè revocare Acacium, & non potuit, nutu Divino percussus est.* Dist. 19. Cap. 9.

proceeding against the Emperour, or his Imperious Comminations against themselves, return him a very meek and submissive answer, renounce *Acacius* and all the Hereticks, and beg to be restored to the State of Salvation, by being received into the Communion of the Apostolick See: But who they were, or how many, we know not, because there are no subscriptions of Names. The Effect of it, as we find by the Instructions of his Successour to his Legates, was that it set the Bishops at variance, and reduc'd all things to dispute and Confusion.

§. XXVI. But the next *Pope Hormisdas*, being a Stout and Resolute man, and finding himself in a better State by the favour of two great Kings, *Theodorick of Italy*, and *Clodoveus of France*, and the Emperour *Anastasius* in a much worse by the Rebellion of *Vitalian the Scythian* against him; he resolved not to lose the opportunity, especially when he found the Stout Emperour begin to bend, for he made the first offer of Treaty, and that with Humility enough, only blaming the stiffness of some of this *Popes* Predecessors towards himself, and profering for the Cure of the present Schisms, to call a general Council. This the *Pope* finding, receives

ceives the business as loftily, justifies his Predecessors, and to his motion of a general Council tells him, that when he knows the cause of calling one, he will give him his Answer. The Emperour replies, It is for curing the Schisms and Divisions in *Scythia*; the *Pope* rejoyns that he will let him know his mind by his Legates. To them he gives private Instructions, not so much as to condescend to any treaty, but upon entire Submission to the Apostolick See: If the Clergy neglect you, take no notice of it, if they court you, refuse any Feast or Entertainment, till by the Reconciliation both Parties are first qualified for the Participation of the Holy Feast: when you deliver my Letters to the Emperour, if he enquire of you their Contents, pretend perfect Ignorance, and refer him to the Letters themselves. But if he persist to enquire what you stand upon, tell him the Council of *Calcedon*. If he say the Bishops are ready to do it, ask whence then arise those divisions and animosities among them. To which if he answer, that they were enflam'd by the Letters of my Predecessor *Symmachus*, tell him that there is nothing faulty in them, unless it be asserting the Council of *Calcedon*. No abatement! But if he say, Communicate with me, I embrace all you desire, both
the

the Council and the Epistles of *Pope Leo*.
 Reply, That we Sir, believe your Integrity, but we first desire your care to make up the breach of the Church. If he ask how; Reply with all humility that your *Holy Father* hath written about that to the Bishops themselves, second these Letters with yours, declaring that you will be govern'd by the Apostolick See, and then as the Orthodox will never leave its unity, So the Hereticks will discover themselves; but if he ask you in the mean time to Communicate with the Bishop of *Constantinople*; By no means, till the Peace be concluded. But what if he receive the Council of *Calcedon* and *Pope Leo's* Letters. Tell him you are glad of that, but refer him for clearing himself to his Tryal before the Council. If the Emperour reply, What will you not leave me my Bishop here for my Spiritual guide. Tell him, You cannot help that, the Canons force him to attend the Council, and that he hath many other Remedies for Ghostly advice, without injuring the forme of Proceedings. If he ask what they are. Tell him, the business will soon be at an End, if he will refer it to the judgement of the Apostolick See. If he consent to all, I may come my self. But above all things they are ordered to avoid the Bishop of *Constantine*

tinople, not so much as to discourse the Emperour before him. And if he desire it, excuse your selves by answering that part of your Errand is to accuse him, and therefore you can say nothing before him till he appear to answer in Council. In short the Council of *Calcedon* and *Pope Leo* must be submitted to by the Emperour, and all the World; *Acacius* and the Hereticks must be disclaim'd, the banish'd Orthodox Bishops restored. And if there be any prosecution of that nature, it is to be referred to the Apostolick See. Here hath this cunning *Pope* betrayed the whole Plot: The Pretence was to be the faith of the Council of *Calcedon*, but the design was to bring both the Emperour, the Rival Bishop of *Constantinople*, and all the Bishops of the *East* to a Submission to the Supremacy of the *Apostolick See*; this he follows with a Letter to the Emperour, to let him know that the Bishop of *Rome* was not wont to be Summon'd to Council by any Emperour of them all, but cares not if he comes, so the Faith of *Calcedon* be own'd, *Pope Leo* justified, and *Acacius* condemn'd. The Emperour complies in all things, only he desires to be excused in the case of *Acacius*, for fear of raising Tumults among the People. But the *Pope* continues stubborn, the Emperour writes to the Senate
of

of *Rome* to soften him, who tell him that nothing is to be done till Justice is first done upon *Acacius* his Name. And so ended the first Embassy. But there follows a second, in which he plainly tells the Emperour in the first place, that it is in vain to talk of any Reconciliation till *Acacius* is condemn'd. But whilst both Parties stand stiff upon these Terms, the Emperour dyed. And *Justin* Succeeds, who having but an ill Title, courts this Powerful *Pope*, and for the same reason the *Pope* courts him. The Emperour first writes to him in the name of the Bishop and Clergy of *Constantinople* to mediate a Reconciliation. But still the answer is, Let them first deliver up the name of *Acacius*, and submit to the *Apostolick See*. The Bishop of *Constantinople* complies with him in all his demands, only omitting that concerning *Acacius*; the *Pope* tells him it is all trifling till that be done, and then adds: *Post hæc quid restat in se ut Sedis Apostolicæ cujus fidem a Te dicis amplecti, sequaris etiam sine trepidatione judicium?* The same he writes to the Emperour: And then sends new Legates with Instructions, like those given to the first in the time of the Emperour *Anastasius*, and writes by them to the Emperour, that no Regard ought to be had to such Persons that Subscribe the Council

Epist. 29.

Epist. 31.

Epist. 32.

cil of *Calcedon* if they refuse to joyn in the condemnation of *Acacius*, as condemn'd Epist. 34. by the Apostolick See. This he repeats to *John* Bishop of *Constantinople*, and making Interest with the Emperers and great men at Court, both the Emperour and Bishop yield, and expunge the Name of *Acacius*; And so the Peace is concluded and the *Pope* Triumphs; and if the Reader desires to see with what Insolence, he may peruse his following Letters, in which he demands the Submission of the Churches of *Alexandria* and *Antioch* as well as *Constantinople*, sends his dispatches into all these *Western* Parts of the World to inform them of his Victories, insults over the Bishops and Clergy of *Constantinople*, receives their Appeals, and orders their Affairs, Governs all Christendom, keeps *Justinian* himself in awe, and dyes in the heighth of his Glory. One of the most fortunate *Popes* in the whole Succession of the *Papal Empire*.

§. XXVII. But as great Conquests seldom long survive the Conqueror, so it hap'n'd here after the Death of this huffing *Pope*. For *Justinian* coming to the Crown, and being resolute and successful, and with all Orthodox, he knew his own Power, and if he used it, the *Popes* had no advantage

tage against him for his Religion, as they had against *Zeno* and *Anastasius*. And though he was forc'd to court and complement *Hormisda*, and to serve his Importunity to serve his own turn ; yet he began at last to grow weary of him, and writes one Letter to him to dispatch this business, and another not to be so severe with the names of dead men, and bobs him with a saying of his *Predecessors*: *Quia vester quoque Prædecessor beatæ recordationis ad memoriæ principalis Anastasium scripsit, ut Si nomen Acacii tantumodo tolleretur, una nobis esset Communio* ; That is the plain truth, and *Justinian* saw through the meaning of all this stir ; the Bishops of *Rome* were resolv'd, if it were possible to trample upon the Pride and Presumption of *Acacius*, that it might never become a Precedent to any of his Successors, to nose them as *Acacius* had done ; but *Justinian* not regarding their displeasure, turns the 28th. Canon of *Calcedon* into an Imperial Law, and institutes new Patriarchates by his own Authority, *Carthage* and *Justiniana prima* the place of his Birth, *Novel* 131. Though how he came to enact so many Ecclesiastical Laws as he did, 'tis difficult to discover ; for himself was altogether unlearned, not so much as able to read ; and *Trebonian* the Lawyer, whom he employed

ed to compile the work was an Heathen, and so but little skill'd in or concern'd for Laws in the Christian Church; and therefore *Baronius* not improbably conjectures that this part of the work was perform'd by the two Bishops of *Constantinople*, *Epiphanius* and *Menna*, and Implicitely confirm'd by the Emperour: And then no wonder if they took care of the dignity of their own See; but whoever drew up the Ecclesiastical Laws, it was taken care of, and the Emperours became oblig'd in honour to their Imperial Laws, as well as their Imperial City to see it preserv'd. And *Constantinople* being thus firmly settled in its Patriarchal Honour, it ever after held it. How this and the other *Exarchs* came by the Title of *Patriarchs* is scarce known, only it is certain that the Title was borrow'd from the wandring *Jews* of those times, who wherever they settled in any Considerable Body, especially in the *East*, had a Supreme Governour whom they stil'd their *Patriarch*; but in the fourth Century they were abrogated by *Theodosius* the younger, for their intolerable insolence; and so this Title and Authority being taken from the *Jews*, it was in a little time after applyed to the *Exarchs* of *Diocesses*, and so we find it used in the Council of *Calcedon*, as Synonomous with the Titles

Ad annum
528.

of Arch-Bishop and Exarch ; and that's the first time that I know of its being us'd in the Christian Church. I am sure we meet nothing of it in the *Theodosian Code*, but in the *Jewish* sence. And from the time of the Council of *Calcedon* it is only used in the Christian Sence, nothing more frequent in the *Justinian Code*, and the Acts of the fifth Council under *Justinian*. And though it was at first given to all the eighth *Exarchs*, yet but five of them retain'd either name or thing, the other three being swallow'd up by *Constantinople*; this was the beginning of the five famous Patriarchates, and the first time that we meet with them reckon'd all together, is in the 36th. Canon of the Council in *Trullo* under *Justinian* the 2^d. *Anno Dom.* 691. where the Order of Precedency is determin'd, having never been defin'd before by Synodical Authority ; how the other four came by this dignity is clear from this foregoing discourse, *Constantinople* leading the way, which I have prov'd to be so far from being instituted the last, that it was the first of all, and that it was for the sake of that, that the Rest were advanc'd to this Dignity. For though *Rome*, *Alexandria* and *Antioch*, had by Custom and the *Nicene* Council gain'd the honour of Precedency ; yet they never pre-

tended to any Power more than Metropolitcal, till such a Power was given to the Bishop of *Constantinople*, and then these having ever been as it were Prerogative Churches, and being then Dioceſan Cities in the new civil Diviſion of the Empire, could not but be advanc'd for ſhame to the ſame Superiority of Power over the Metropolitans of their own Dioceſſes: But how *Jeruſalem* could come to the dignity and Authority of a Patriarchate, is, I muſt confeſs, a great Myſtery; for though true it is that it was the *Mother Church*, of all *Chriſtian Churches*, ſo that if any Church could Challenge any Superiority over all others, that had the faireſt Plea; yet it was ſo far from ſo high a Claim, that it was never advanc'd to the Power of a Metropolitan, but was ever ſubject to the Metropolis of *Cæſarea*; and yet now I know not how all on a ſudden it is advanc'd to Patriarchal Sovereignty. But by what means or upon what grounds, it being no Dioceſan City; I cannot find. *Lib. 4. c. 25*
Sozomen indeed informs us that *St. Cyril* of *Jeruſalem* had attempted to remove the Metropolitcal Jurisdiction from *Cæſarea*, to his own See, under pretence of its being the Apoſtolick Throne; but that *Acacius* the preſent Biſhop of *Cæſarea* was too hard for him, and upon the Provocation

X

pro

De instit.
Pag. 192.

Epist. 16.

proceeded with that severity against him, as to procure his Deposition by a Provincial Synod. So that no Alteration was effected at that time as to Metropolitick, much less Patriarchal Dignity. But *Petrus de Marca* tells us, That *Juvenal* Bishop of *Jerusalem* taking Advantage of the Quarrel between *Cyril* of *Alexandria*, and *John* Bishop of *Antioch*, in the Council of *Ephesus*, endeavoured to bring both the *Palestines* that were Subject to *Antioch*, under his own Jurisdiction, and effected it by the Emperours Edict, procur'd by the Bishop of *Constantinople* to make way for the great leap that himself was taking out of a Subject Bishoprick, over the heads of great Metropolitans. And it is certain that *Juvenal* was a great Court-Parasite, and so might obtain such Letters, but that he did I know no Proof, and wish this Learned man had produc'd his Author, that this mystery might have been unriddled. That *Juvenal* had such a design in the Council of *Ephesus*, I find in *Pope Leo's* Letters to *Maximus* Bishop of *Antioch*, *Sicut enim in Ephesina Synodo Juvenalis Episcopus ad obtinendum Palestinae Provinciae Principatum credidit se posse sufficere, & insolentes ausus per commentitia Scripta firmare, Quod sanctae memoriae Cyrillus Alexandrinus Episcopus merito perhorrescens,*
scrip.

*Scriptis suis mihi, quid prædicta Cupiditas
 ausa est, indicavit, & sollicitâ prece multum
 poposcit, ut nulla illicitis conatibus præbere-
 tur assensio.* I cannot tell what he means by
 the *commentitia scripta*, unless pretended
Mandates, from Court, but it is likely he ob-
 tained not his request in that Council;
 when *Cyril* that govern'd all there was so
 violent against it; however he kept up his
 Pretence so powerfully, that *Maximus*
 at last was forc'd to compound with him,
 and the composition was settled by a Re-
 ference to the Council of *Calcedon*, that
Maximus should keep *Arabia* and both Att. 7.
 the *Phœnicias*, and *Juvenal* should have
 the three *Palestines*. This is all the account
 that I can find of the Institution of this fifth
 Patriarchate, that had no other foundation
 than *Juvenal's* Impudence in stealing three
 whole Provinces, and leaping over the
 Head of his own Metropolitan. Though
 the Truth is *Juvenal* hereby offer'd no In-
 jury to the Rights of the Bishop of *Anti-
 och*, but only rob'd him of part of his
 Spoils, as Thieves and Beasts of Prey are
 wont to serve one another; for the legal
 Jurisdiction of the Bishop of *Antioch* reach-
 ed not beyond the Province of *Syria*, and all
 the other Provinces that were shared be-
 tween him and *Juvenal* of *Jerusalem*, were
 only the gains of Usurpation, and when a

man hath no Right, he hath none to lose; all Usurpers are in Mr. *Hobb's* his State of Nature, that live by mutual Stealth, and have no Law or Measure of Right but present Possession. And therefore *Juvenal* had as good a Title as *Maximus*, and in my Opinion somewhat better; for of all men the first that does wrong is least capable of Right, and they that rob him of his Prey do some Justice to the wronged cause. And it must be confessed that the See of *Antioch* had been a great and an old Encroacher, as we find by the Case of the *Cyprian* Bishops, whom in the time of *Innocent* the first, it would have swept away with divers other Provinces; For so the *Pope* commands that that Island should do as other Provinces did, in submitting themselves to the Bishop of *Antioch*; so that it seems there were then some Provinces that were quite carried away captive, and it was in the *Popes* Eye a great Singularity in the Bishops of *Cyprus* (who probably were the last to be conquered as being an Island) to stand it out when all others had long since yielded up the Keys of their Supremacy into his hands.

§. XXVIII. But to return to the two great Champions of *Rome* and *Constantinople*. *Pope Hormisdas* being dead, I do not find

find that the War broke out in the time of the two next Successors, *John* the first and *Fælix* the third, whose Reigns were too short for any great Action, especially the first, whose whole time was taken up in an Embassay to *Constantinople*, and after his Return, in Imprisonment; and as he lived not two years, so his Successor *Fælix* lived but two months, and odd days beyond it. But it is probable that the *Constantinopolitans* not regarding the Articles of Peace, went on in their accustomed Usurpation, and it is no wonder if Complaints were not so suddainly brought to *Rome*; and that likely was the Reason that we hear nothing of this business under these two *Popes*: But in the time of *Boniface* the 2^d. who sat but two years it broke forth with great Violence. *Stephen* Bishop of *Larissa* the Metropolis of *Thessaly* being canonically elected and ordained, was by the Faction of *Probianus* one of his own Suffragans, and the Authority of *Epiphanius* Bishop of *Constantinople* Irregularly deprived of his Bishoprick; he appeals to *Rome*, and tells a sad story of his Sufferings; *Boniface* Summons a Council, where the whole business was canvased from the beginning: for now the War coming nearer home into *Illyricum*, which the *Popes* had hitherto kept, it alarm'd the Jealousie

of Rome , lest they should lose so great a Part of their Jurisdiction ; the Complaints of *Stephen* are read, and the sum of the Story is, that he was deposed for not owning the Authority of *Constantinople* , and appealing as in duty bound to the *Apostolick See* ; and among the rest he tells them, That when he did but mention that the *Pope* should at least be acquainted with the matter before Sentence was Pronounced, they for that reason were so severe upon him, *Quod dictum magis eos adversum me amplius incitavit ; putantes de Sacrarum Ecclesiarum Regiæ urbis jure aliquid minui, quod Ego Apostolorum vestram sedem visus sum nominasse.* And in the second Session, *Stephen* with two other Bishops of his Province *Elpidius* and *Timotheus* , tell the Council that the *Constantinopolitans* endeavour to bring their Province under the *Constantinopolitan* Jurisdiction, that after that Example no man may dare to speak of the right of Churches and Custom of Antiquity, because their design is to bring other Provinces under the Authority of the *Royal City*. But this Controversie concerned *Rome* it self as closely as the Bishop of *Larissea* , and therefore upon this Occasion they fall to examining the right of the *Apostolick See* to *Illyricum* , and to that purpose produced many Letters of former
Popes

Popes and Emperours to prove it; *Pope Damasus* is the first, but cited Impertinently enough; when *Maximus* the *Cynick* pretended to the Bishoprick of *Constantinople*, he writes to the Clergy of the City against him, and desires them to choose a fitter Person; from whence this Council would infer some Authority of the *Pope* over *Constantinople* it self, whereas the Letter intimates no such thing, nor doth *Damasus* dream of any Pretence to it, but only gives them Friendly advice (as any one Church may another) when they meet in Council to Elect a fit Person; nay, he is not come so far as the Language of the *Apostolick See*, that was set up after his time to oppose to that of the *Royal City*. But any Logic will serve Ambition. The next is *Siricius* to as little purpose, who writes to *Anysius* Metropolitan of *Illyricum*, that he suffer no Ordinations to be made there without his own Consent, as the Canons of *Nice* command; this is a doubty proof of *Siricius* his Pretence to Authority over *Illyricum*, when he only writes to a Neighbour Bishop, than which nothing was at that time more common, to observe the Canons. *Anastasius* is passed over: *Innocent* the first speaks with more confidence, and adviseth with more Authority, as if he would, but durst not

pretend to an Authority over *Illyricum*, and therefore he only Commends it in an half Commanding way to the Government of its own Metropolitan. *Zosimus* the next *Pope* is passed by, his Reign was short, and spent in his *African* and *Gallican* Usurpations. *Boniface* the first comes next, and he indeed talks bigger words, and insists much upon the *Apostolick Chair*, and it was but time, for then the *Royal City* was come to its heighth of Glory. What the matter was is not evident, but something had been done by somebody in the Province of *Illyricum*, that must not pass, and that too by somebody that was no more than an ordinary Bishop, who took upon him to set up against the *Apostolick See*, and who that was, is easy to guess. *Audio Episcoporum quosdam Apostolico jure contempto novum quippiam contra Christi proprię præcepta tentare, cum se ab Apostolicę Sedis Communionem, et ut dicam verius* (that is but faintly said) *poteslate se separare nituntur; Eorum petentes Auxilium* (that is the Crime) *quos Ecclesiasticarum sanctio regularum majoris esse non dedit Potestatis.* The intimation is plain enough, but lest he should not be thoroughly understood, he tells us which was the second and the third See next to *Rome*, and how that they had alwayes been so civil

as to be content with their Place; and as for the City of *Constantinople*, when *Theodosius* had a Design to make *Nectarius* Bishop, he sent for the Consent of the *Apostolick See*. So that there was the grievance (whatsoever the particular cause was) the Bishop of *Constantinople's* meddling with any thing in *Illyricum*. But matters rested not here, the Emperours were engaged in the Controversie, and it is referred to the *Præfetti Prætorio*, as appears by *Honorius* his Letter to *Theodosius*, and *Theodosius* his Answer. But it came to nothing, for we find the same Controversie depending in the time of his Successor *Celestine*, who writes to the same purpose as *Boniface* had done, to keep all Forreign Jurisdiction out of *Illyricum*, to settle its Government under the Metropolitan of *Theffalonica*. But at length the *Romanists* gain ground, for in the Letters of *Xystus* that followed next, we find him Congratulating the Conversion of *Perigenes*, who had raised all the Controversie, by appealing from the Bishop of *Theffalonica* to *Constantinople*, and his Submission to his Metropolitan, and withal writes to *Proclus* of *Constantinople* to be more cautious against the *Subreptions* of Bishops (for that was their term for Uncanonical Appeals) and that for the time to come he entertain
none

none of the Clergy of the Province of *Illyricum*, without commendatory Letters from the Bishop of *Theſſalonica*, which broadly intimates that *Proclus* had been guilty of ſome *Subreption* in that Province. And then in the laſt place writes to the Biſhops of *Illyricum* to ſtand upon their guard againſt Forreign Jurisdiction and be obedient to their own Metropolitan. *Nec his vos, fratres Chriſſimi, conſtitutis, quæ præter noſtra præcepta Orientalis Synodus decernere voluit, credatis tenere præter id quidem quod de fide nobis conſentientibus judicavit.* Neither, my Brethren, think your ſelves obliged by the Decrees of the Eaſtern Council, unleſs what it deſign'd as to matters of Faith with our Conſent. Now this *Eaſtern Council* that he here ſpeaks of, could not be that of *Calcedon*, he being dead eleven years before it was called, and therefore could be none but the Council of *Conſtantinople*, which giving only Preheminence of Dignity to that City next to *Rome*, had been it ſeems pleaded for Preheminence of power over other Provinces. But now comes the Council of *Calcedon*, and Letters of *Pope Leo*, of which we have already given an Account, though beſides them, there are ſome others that are preſerv'd only in this manuſcript of this *Roman Synod* (firſt published by
Hol-

Holstenius, and now inserted into the *Con-*
cilia Max. in its proper place, with his
 own Learned Notes upon it.) One to the Pag. 1717.
 Emperour *Marcian*, herein he declares his
 Reconciliation to *Anatolius* upon his Sub-
 mission, and an Answer to him from *Ana-*
tolius, in which he farther excuses himself.
De his autem quæ Constantinopolitanæ
gratiâ sedis, &c. But the most remarkable
 Letters that are thereby preserv'd, are one
 to *Anastasius* Bishop of *Thessalonica*, and
 two to the Metropolitans of *Illyricum* and
Achaia, in which he Subjects all the Me-
 tropolitans of both to the Ordination and
 Authority of the Bishop of *Thassalonica* as
 his *Vice-Gerent*, and sets up Appeals from
 the Provincial Synods to him. So that at
 the same time that this great *Pope* is beat-
 ing down this Ambition at *Constantinople*,
 out of pure reverence to the Canons, is he
 breaking the very same Canons in *Illyri-*
cum by setting up a Jurisdiction, Superi-
 or to Metropolitans and Provincial Sy-
 nods. So much for this Synod of *Rome*
 under *Boniface* the second, for here the in-
 script ends, and a short time after the *Pope*
 dyed; so that what was the Event we
 know not, only it is certain that *Rome*
 held the Possession, for it was never taken
 from them and given to *Constantinople*, till
 the time of *Leo Isaurus*, who being Ex-
 com-

communicated by *Gregory* the second, in the Controversie about Images; he to be reveng'd of the *Pope*, laid both this and a great deal more of his Territories to the Jurisdiction of *Constantinople*.

§. XXIX. But to return to the time of *Justinian*, after the Death of *Boniface*; the Controversie slept under *John* the 2^d. but broke out by a side wind under *Agapetus*, who being sent on an Embassy to *Constantinople*, found *Anthimus* then Bishop of it an *Eutychian*, glad of which he Schools the Emperour for Electing such an *Heretic*; this brings the Emperour himself into Suspicion of *Heresie* among the People, and that forces him for his own Justification to Publish his Confessions of Faith, in some of which he sordidly Flatters the *Roman* Bishop, and at his Importunity deposes *Anthimus*; and such an Affront as that to the Patriarch of the *Royal City*, was Victory enough for *Agapetus*, though he had the fate of *Epaminondas* to know but not survive his Conquest; for *Anthimus* was not Synodically deposed till after his Death, by the Council of *Constantinople* under *Menna*, whom the *Pope* had engaged the Emperour to prefer to that See; However *Agapetus* had the Glory of the Work, and to him it is ascrib'd by the
Monks

Monks of Constantinople, who were the *Ass. 1.*
Solicitors against Anthimus. This was one
 of the greatest blows given to *Constantin-*
ople by Rome during all this Civil War be-
 tween the two Sees, for a Bishop of *Rome*
 to depose a Bishop of *Constantinople*, to
 confirm it by the Civil Sanction of the
 Emperour, that was the deposed Bishops *Novel 42.*
 Patron, and put a Creature of his own
 in his stead, who was oblig'd to be grate-
 ful and obedient to his Creator, and accor-
 dingly he concludes the Sentence against
Anthimus, with paying Devotion to him.
We follow and obey the Apostolick See, and
those that it Communicates with, we receive
to Communion, and those that it Condemns,
we Condemn. And he was all his time such
 a Spaniel to the Bishop of *Rome*, that he
 fetch'd and carried at his Command, and
 so when he Subscrib'd to *Justinian's* Edict,
 against the *tria Capitula*, he did it with
 this Reserve, That if the Bishop of *Rome*
 approved not the Edict, that then his
 Subscription should be null and void. But
 the Contest ended not so, for though *Ag-*
apetus scaped scot-free by speedy Death, his
 Successor *Silverius* paid the Reckoning. *The-*
odora the Empress taking *Anthimus* his part
 sent *Vigilius* to *Belisarius* then at *Rome*, to
 command *Pope Silverius* to restore *Anthi-*
mus, who refusing it, was accused of High
 Trea-

Treason, for holding Correspondence with the *Goths*, and so deposed and thrust into a Monastery, and *Vigilius* put in his Place, who getting it by Usurpation, Legitimated it by a legal Election upon the Death of *Silverius*, and when that was done, defy'd the Empress, and refused to restore *Anthimus*, huffs the Emperour in defence of the Privileges of St. *Peter's* Chair, Suspendes *Menna* the Bishop of *Constantinople*, together with all the *Eastern* Metropolitans, Chatechises the Emperour with the Rod of Excommunication in his hand, Actually Excommunicates the Empress, and all her Favorites, especially *Theodorus* of *Cæsarea*, opposes the Emperours Edict, concerning the *third Capitula*, Excommunicates *Menna*, and all that subscrib'd it, so incenses the Emperour that (to shelter himself against his displeasure) he is forc'd to take Sanctuary in St. *Peter's* Church, and then by night to escape to *Calcedon*, where he forces the Emperour to revoke his Edict, and brings *Menna* and *Theodorus* to Submission: Necessitates the Emperour to call the fifth general Council, and when they are met refuseth to sit with them, tells them that he will signify his mind by writing, forbids them to Decree any thing till they understand his Pleasure, opposeth the Emperour and Coun-

Council in the Condemnation of the *three Capitula*, is banish't, and in his Banishment Condemns the *three Capitula* himself, and calls the Decree of his Condemnation *διατίπσις* which Word was proper to the Emperour's Edicts. Upon all which there is one pleasant observation in *Petrus de Marca*, of the great Authority that the *Pope* then had from ancient times, in that *Vigilius* shew'd great Reverence to the four first general Councils, because they had been confirm'd by the *Pope*, but this fifth he would not so much as design to give it the Title of Council, because it wanted his Consent. After this manner are we forc'd to catch at every thing, how remote soever, for our Supremacy; for otherwise so wise a man as *de Marca* could have concluded nothing else from this Action of *Vigilius*, than his own unparalell'd Insolence and Capriciousness; for what can be more extravagant than first to force a general Council, and when it meets, to take State or Pet, and refuse to joyn with them, and forbid them to Act without him; to send his Peremptory Opinion to the Emperour against that of the Council; and when he is banish'd for his Perverseness, to send a kind of Imperial Edict to declare his Consent to their Decree; and after all this refuse to
give

give them the Civil Title of a Council? all this can argue nothing, but a very weak and Childish Peevishness. And yet is he brought off, not only for his Unchangeable Constancy, but for his wise and prudent Conduct in the whole Management of this Affair. And in the first place he is his own Apologist, and gives a fair Account as he thinks of his own Innocence, in his Decretal Epistle of Recantation, and first he saith: *The Devil cheated him, and by his Subtile Insinuations had drawn him in without regard to Brotherly Love and Charity to sow Discord and Division in the Christian Church.* This is a very fair Confession of a very foul fault, the Crime is great in it self, and how much soever the Devil shar'd in it, the guilt will lye at his own Door; otherwise if that were any excuse for a Crime, it is common to all Mankind, and every man may as well as the *Pope* load the Devil with his own Miscarriages. But if the Devil were so busy and Malitious with the head of the Church in this matter, that is a sign that it was of very Mischievous Consequence to the Body: For Mischief is the Motive of his Zeal, so that where he is most Active, he doth most harm; and what can be worse than for the first and most Honourable Bishop in *Christendom,*

dom, upon whom at that time in a great Measure depended the good Government of the Church, to demean himself after that Factious and Disorderly rate, no body knows for what, neither himself why, but that the Devil, he knows not how, had blown a cross-grain'd *Capriccio* into his head. An admirable Apology suited to the Temper and the Modesty of the Man. But what will he say to his contradicting himself so grossly and publickly in the face of the World? To that his answer is easy and ready. That he was grown wiser and might retract as well as St. *Austin*. It is true, but then neither he nor St. *Austin* must be infallible, but I think infallibility was not then pretended to, and therefore shall not object that; But what will he say for the Fury and Vehemence of his Actings whilst he was mistaken? let him confess his ill Manners as well as his Error. With what rudeness did he treat the Bishops, and will he now give them no Satisfaction? *Menna*, and the *Eastern* Bishops were wrong'd and disgrac'd by his Excommunication, will he make them no amends, not so much as ask them forgiveness? take no notice either of his own folly, or their Injury, but only after an Imperious manner, and in the Imperial Stile command them to be of their own Opini-

Marcas' dis-
sert. de 5to.
Concilio, in
the Concilia
Maxima,
Vol. 5. p.
601.
Epist. ad Ep
ist. c. 8.

on. But the most Surprizing excuse for their Inconstancy, is that of his Successor Pelagius the second. *Si igitur in trium capitulorum negotio, &c.* Concil. Max. Vol. 5. P. 611. *What if he grew wiser upon enquiry in the business of the tria Capitula? Why must the change of a Man's Opinion be objected to this See, which is Honour'd by all the Church in its Governour, for it is not the Change of Opinion, but the Inconstancy of Apprehension that is to be blamed. When therefore an unchangeable resolution holds out to the discovery of Truth, what harm is it, if leaving his Ignorance, he alter his Story? Truly none at all, if he were a modest man, and would not take too much upon him, and comptrol the whole World, and Doom every man to Hell, that was not or would not be so foolish or so ignorant as himself. But this is a pretty Device to prove that let a Pope change his mind never so often, he is always constant to himself, and so indeed are all the greatest time-servers; It is not the men but the times that alter, they are always true to themselves and their own Interest: but however I will not charge that upon this Action, and will allow that Vigilius might be an hot-headed honest man, and was not wrought upon by hopes or tears in his Recantation: Yet sure let*

us not be born down that he never chang'd his opinion , only because he always thought himself in the Right ; neither let men go about to excuse his extream Indiscretion for his Violence and fury either way , and when he was grown so much wiser, as to find himself deceiv'd, he should have been so much wiser too , as at least to think it possible for him to be deceiv'd again, and not without any acknowledgement of his Blunder, to Impose his new Opinion upon all the World under pain of Damnation ; and that upon those very Persons, that he had before so Peremptorily Damn'd for holding it : Certainly all this is very inconsistent with good manners and prudent Government, but would have been Intollerable if he had pretended to that rank Infallibility that his Successors now challenge. But the man that brings him off with Triumph and flying Colours is the Learned *P. de Marca*, in a Treatise purposely written upon the Argument, and since inserted into the *Concil. Max. Vol. 5. p. 601.* in which he thought he had done such a good piece of Service to the Apostolick See, as might very well suffice to expiate all his suppos'd Offences against it, as he tells *Innocent* the tenth in his Supplicatory Libel, after he had been four years kept out of his

Bishoprick, and probably this promoted his Dispatch; for not long after he receiv'd his Confirmation: And I must confess he deserv'd it, for he did his best Endeavour, and hath with no small shew of Learning made the Cause look somewhat fair and plausible, though when all's done, it is so Transparently bad, that nothing can relieve it. First he pleads that this was a Controversie, not concerning Faith but Persons. So that if the *Pope* were mistaken it was a matter of no great moment. But if it were not, why did he make such a stir about it; to what purpose should he put the whole Church into a Flame about a Trifle? His Errour is not objected to him, but his wild demeanor, which is made much more inexcusable by this Apology, in that all this outrageous Zeal was not spent upon any point of Religion, but only the Opinions of some private men, and that's the highest Aggravation of a Schism to break the Peace of the Church, for things in which it is not at all concern'd. But secondly, this Controversie was not only about Persons, but points of Religion, *i. e.* Whether such Opinions held by such Authors ought to be condemn'd by the Church or not? *Vigilius* was a long time for the Negative, and then at last in his Decretal Epistle con-

condemns them as contrary to the *Christian Faith*, and *Blasphemous Impieties*: and certainly the *Christian Faith* is, if any were, concern'd in such Cases as contradict or Blaspheme it. So that if his last Decree be true, he had been all along an Assertor of *Blasphemy*; but if it be not, then it is still False. So strangely hath the man entangled himself with his own Passion, that no Wit or Ingenuity can set him loose from his own Folly. But not content with this slender Excuse, the Learned man proceeds to make out his prudent Management of the business. For we must know, saith he, that there are two ways of Exercising Ecclesiastical Discipline, either strictly according to severity of Canon, or with Temperament abating of rigour of Law, when by that the Peace and Unity of the Church may be better preserv'd; Both which ways *Vigilius* acted, as he was directed by change of Circumstances, for preservation of Truth and Peace. And yet the *Pope* carried things so awkerdly, that he hath cross'd the Apology both ways. For as for Rigour of Canon, he had no such Pretext to oppose the Condemnation of the *tria Capitula*. And whereas he pretends that it look'd like correcting the Council of *Calcedon*; if that were of any force, it

takes away all Government ; for upon the same Terms no new Law may be Enacted, lest it reflect upon the Imperfection of former Legislators. And upon the same ground the Council of *Calcedon* it self ought never to have pass'd with Authority, because it Innovated divers things, that were never admitted by any of the former Councils. But however granting that it may be unmannerly to add to, or depart from the Decrees of General Councils, as *Pope Leo* determines, yet that Rule concerns matters of Faith, and not particular Controversies, relating to single Persons ; and therefore it is no way pertinent to the Rule it self, to affirm that these Authors ought not to be condemn'd of *Herésie*, because they are not particularly condemn'd by the Council of *Calcedon*, especially when *Vigilius* himself pleads in his Decretal, that the Opinions themselves were condemn'd for damnable Heresies, and then the Case is plain, that whoever holds them, ought to be censured as an Heretick. However he had no Canon to Justifie his first Obstinacy, and therefore it is a meer Precarious Plea of *de Marca*. And then to pass by many intermediate Actions, upon which our Learned man would put a fair Gloss, his last Decree was so far from Temperament, that

that it was more Furious than all the rest; for he might have condemn'd the *tria Capitula* to preserve the Peace and Unity of the Church, but then what need of charging them with so foul a thing as Blasphemy? for if he only condescended for Peace sake, he ought to have pass'd them over with a general Sentence of Condemnation. But if he condemn'd them for their own Impiety, then there was no Condescension in the Compliance, but what he did was in prosecution of an Indispensable Duty. So unhappy is this great man in his labour'd Apology: That where he pleads strict Law, there was perfect Liberty, and where he pleads Liberty, there was strict Law. And that was the unlucky Fury of that Passionate Pope, that which way soever he went, he was always in the wrong. And therefore how confidently soever *Vigilius* might look, after his Recantation, and whatsoever Apologies the *Roman* Clients and Parasites may have made to varnish over the Action, it was the foulest Baffle that was ever given to that See, and lost them as much ground as all the huffing of *Leo the Great* and *Hormisdas* had gain'd. And therefore the *Constantinopolitans* having got this Advantage, and the Emperour on their side, who indeed had plaid foul play

in this whole matter, for he promised to call a general Council, of an equal number of *Eastern* and *Western* Bishops, and yet Summon'd only the *Eastern*, and the *Pope* himself, who was to appear in Person, and not by his Legates, of this the *Pope* had reason to complain; but then he ought in prudence to have stood to it, and not to submit; for when the Council was conven'd by his procurement, and he was so openly overrul'd by it, he gave them that Advantage that they would be sure never to lose. And therefore as I was saying they made their best of it, and finding themselves Masters of the field, resolv'd to make good their Ground, and pursue their Victory; so that having overtop'd all the other Patriarchates, and having no Rival left but *Rome*, they were now once more embolden'd to push for an Universal Supremacy.

§. XXX. And their Pursuit was very easy, there being no enemy to make head against them; for *Pelagius* the first that Succeeded, having subscrib'd the late Council, with which the *Western* Bishops being highly displeased, for the Affront and neglect that had been put upon them, they refused his Communion, insomuch that he could procure but two Bishops
and

and one Presbyter to be present at his Consecration, and instead of Forreign Wars, he was wholly employed in settling Peace at home; and that is the Subject of his Epistles to perswade his Neighbour Bishops to a Reconciliation, and incite the Courtiers to bring them to it by Violence and Compulsion; so that he was never so much as able to recollect his Scattered Forces. Neither were his three next Successors, *John the third*, *Benedict the first*, and *Pelagius the second*, the *Western Church* being over-run with Schism about the *tria Capitula*, and *Italy* it self miserably harrastr by the *Lombards*, only the last labour'd (or rather *Gregory* in his name, and by his command) to reduce his Bishops to obedience, but all in vain, for they were too head-strong, and both his Interest and his Arguments were too weak; of the latter I have given a tast in his Endeavour to prove *Vigilius* constant in his Inconstancy. But now are we come to the very *Pharfa-lian* Field, in which was determin'd the Empire of the Universal Church. For *Gregory* the great Succeeding, a man of a Military Education, great Courage, Popular Piety and Devotion; he is no sooner settled in his Throne, but he laboursevery where for the settlement of the Church, and by his great Activity obtain'd an U-
ni-

niversal Authority in it, Deposing Patriarchs, and comptrolling Provincial Synods; and as he took to himself the Office of Universal Pastor, so *John* Bishop of *Constantinople* assum'd the Title, and obtain'd to have it settled upon him and his Successors, by the Authority of *Mauritius* the Emperour. This puts *Pope Gregory* into a Rage, and he immediately Flies out against it, as the very height of *Antichristian Pride* and *Insolence*, especially when *Mauritius* had given him the Title of Fool, for with that he begins his Complaint about this business; the first Letter that he sends to *Mauritius* is to complain of his being call'd Fool, and tax'd of indiscretion, and minds him of that Reverence that is to be shewn to the Priesthood by the Example of *Constantine* the great; in the next he thunders against the Title of Universal Bishop, but so opposeth the setting of the name upon the Bishop of *Constantinople*, as to settle the real Authority of the thing upon the Bishop of *Rome*; for that is his Argument, that though *St. Peter* and his Successours receiv'd from our Saviour Universal Power over the Church, yet he was so modest as never to challenge the Title of Universal Apostle. But this is an odd kind of Counterfeit Humility that is practised by the
Popes

Popes of Rome, whilst they make the proudest claims to give themselves the humblest Titles, and under the name of *Servus Servorum*, to make themselves Princes of the World: But however, if the thing were granted by our Saviour to St. Peter, I understand not what Pride it would have been to have own'd it by its proper name, especially when the Government of the Church through all Ages depended upon the clearness of his Title to it; so that the Result of the Argument is this, that it was a proud thing in John of Constantinople to assume that Title that was only due to himself. But this moves not the Emperour, who only returns him this answer, as Gregory complains, *ut cum fratre & Consacerdote meo Joanne debeam esse pacificus*, i. e. to be satisfied with what is done. Upon this he Beleaguers the Empress, and lays the stress of his cause upon the injury that was done to St. Peter, not to himself, and tells her that she ought to be kind to his Church out of Gratitude, because she had receiv'd the Absolution of her Sins by vertue of his Authority: So that it is not the cause of the *Catholick Church*, that he so Zealously appears for against *Constantinople*, but of his own See. And though he would make it seem to be the cause of the whole

Epist. 34.

whole Church, by inferring that if he were Universal Bishop, he would be sole Bishop too; yet the Consequence is equally odious and Illogical; for could he not pretend to a regular Power over all other Bishops, but presently there must be no other Bishops besides himself? He had Supreme Power within his own Patriarchate; Was he therefore sole Bishop in it? Nay St. *Peter* (as St. *Gregory* informs us) was Universal Pastor, though in modesty he would not take the Title: Was there therefore no other? If it follows in one case, it follows in both, if not, in neither. And when he tells the Emperour *Mauritius* that the same Title that *John* had Usurp'd, was offer'd to the Bishop of *Rome* by the Council of *Calcedon*, but was refused because it seem'd to diminish the Honour of other Bishops. Though here I doubt his Holiness somewhat leases, for no man besides himself ever heard of any such offer; neither was there so good understanding between the *Pope* and the Council in this matter; they granted him Precedency, or the Title of the first Bishop, but nothing of Supremacy; So that it is but another cast of St. *Gregory's* Logic, to infer one from the other. But supposing the Truth of the Assertion, does it follow that they therefore resign'd their Bishop-

Bishopricks, and constituted him sole Bishop of the World : This were too ridiculous and too precarious to affirm, so that he dares not do it here; for the Reason that he gives of the Refusal is, because it would diminish the Honour of other Bishops, but certainly it is one thing to lose a little Honour, and another to be strip't of all Authority. This therefore is plainly an Invidious Consequence of St. Gregory, to infer from the Title of *Universal Bishop* that of *sole Bishop*, thereby to draw all other Bishops to his side. So that it is plain the Competition was between these two Sees, who should have the Universal Monarchy, and not between *Constantinople* and the *Catholick Church*; Neither was it the cause of St. Peter that he pleaded but his own, for St. Peter never alledg'd that we know of *Tu es Petrus* for any Universal Monarchy; nay if we may believe St. Gregory never openly own'd it, or if he did, he was long since dead, and what happened now was none of his, but his Successors cause; however this is a poor begging of the Question, for humble St. Gregory to transfer the Odium of the Controversie from himself to St. Peter, unless he could have better prov'd that St. Peter either had or pretended to any such Universal Authority. Then he falls upon the
 Bi-

Epist. 38. Bishop himself, and Preaches him a Sermon of Humility, and to his former Arguments tells him, That by assuming this Title he will become like *Lucifer*, when he said he would ascend above the Stars and the Clouds, because the Bishops are Stars that enlighten mens minds, and Clouds that rain upon them Showers of Truth. But Bishop *John* knowing that Bishops were neither Stars nor Cloudes, was not affrighted with the Argument of ascending so high, for he knew he stood upon firm Ground, and had both Emperour and Empress to support him. And therefore taking Occasion to write to the Pope about another business stiles himself,

Epist. 39. as the Pope complains in his Letter to *Sabinian*, *pene per omnem versum orbemque* Patriarcha, and so dies the Prince of Pride, the Forerunner of *Antichrist*, and the Father of Blasphemy; all which Titles and a great many more St. *Gregory* hath bestowed upon that of *Oecumenical Bishop*. But whatever became of him, *Cyriacus* his Successour was not at all scared with St. *Gregory's* Threatnings, and persists in the same claim with his Predecessour; *Gregory* writes to him to lay aside that *Nefandum Nomen*, and intimates as if it were to be the Article of their Communion. The Emperour writes to him and taxes him with

with indiscretion to make such a stir about a frivolous name; he answers, and that indeed wisely enough, That though he very much disliked the thing, yet he was not so indiscreet as for that to deny Communion with him; and that though it were a frivolous name, it was of dangerous Consequence, and would make way to bring in *Antichristan Pride* into the Church. And then he endeavours to draw to his Party the Patriarchs of *Alexandria* and *Antioch*, and makes it their Controversie, as well as his own; and the better to induce them to it, he is content to divide *St. Peter's* Primacy between the three Sees; but this was to no purpose, for they had in the time of his Predecessour *Pelagius* the second, given their consent to the thing in a Council of *Constantinople*, as himself intimates; and *Pelagius* complains, that it was done in their own *Conventicle*. And so the Controversie rested all the time of *Mauritius*; but he being Barbarously Murder'd by his Rebel Servant *Phocas*, who was not content to deprive his Master both of Crown and Life, but first Murder'd him in his Children, Sacrificing them all before his Eyes, before he laid the Knife to his own Throat; one of the greatest instances of insulting and inhumanity, that is upon Record.

And

Epist. 31.

L. 4. E. 34.
L. 1. E. 8.

And yet this Brutal Wretch, that had no pretence, nor Title to the Crown, but a casual and suddain Tumult, that had thus Brutishly Imbrued his hands in Royal Bloud, was no sooner settled in his Usurped Tyranny, but St. *Gregory* Congratulates the Providence that delivered the Empire from its former miserable Condition, and plac'd him on the Throne for the publick good. And this I must confess I cannot but take very heinously from a man that pretended to so much Integrity; for as for his Prevaricating in the Controversie of Univerfality, it is possible that he might not understand the Pride of his own heart; and that's a common thing for men that are conceited of their Humility (as it is plain he was by his boasting so much of it) to be guilty of the haughtiest Pride without being sensible of it. He believ'd himself a very humble and Mortified man, and therefore never suspected any Proud designs in his own Actions, and for that reason that vanity that he thought *Anti-christian Pride* in another, he thought consistent with humility in himself. But this was downright Dishonesty to justifie such a wretch in his Villany, only to serve his own Ambition, for the old Complaint against the Bishop of *Constantinople* is in the Tail of all his Flattery; when once
he

he found that he had got into the Tyrant, in his first Letter he Congratulates the happiness of the Times, and the Goodness of God in his Advancement to the Throne. *Epist. l. ii.* He presently sends his *Apocryfary* according to ancient Custom to reside in the Court of *Constantinople*, as the Tyrant desired, and excuses himself that there were none residing before he came to the Crown, by the badness of the Times and the Barbarity of their usage : The Tyrant being thus prepared, he Assaults the Empress, as thinking that she was more easily to be overcome with Flattery ; and when he had discharg'd that Topick with Ful-somness enough, he then thinks fit to insinuate his own Interest, *Rogare forsitan debui, &c.* What encouragement he found I know not, but it is certain that he took heart upon it, and therefore writes to *Cyriacus* himself after a more Peremptory manner than he was wont to do in the time of *Mauritius*, advising him, That he make haste to remove out of the Church, the Scandal of that Perverse and Proud Title, lest he find himself separated from the *Communion of his Peace*. But after he had thus Flattered and caress'd the Tyrant in all his Wickedness, he liv'd not to reap the Fruits of it, for the Title of Universal Bishop was not taken from

*Epist. 38.**Epist. 45.**Epist. 46.**Pag. 1535.**Epist. 47.*

Constantinople and settled upon the See of *Rome*, till the time of *Pope Boniface* the third his Successour, who obtain'd from *Phocas* to declare that it appertain'd not of Right to the Bishop of *Constantinople*, who had Usurp'd it, but was the peculiar right of the *Roman See*. This *Boniface* had been *St. Gregory's* Resident at Court, and for his Courtly behaviour toward the Tyrant, was chosen to succeed in the See; and *Cyriacus* a little after falling under the Tyrants displeasure, for siding with the Relations of *Mauritius*, and declaring against the Execrable Murder of *Phocas*, *Boniface* seizes the Opportunity of his displeasure, and easily prevails with him to declare by publick Edict, That the Bishop of *Rome* was Head of the Universal Church, and commanded the Bishop of *Constantinople* to forbear assuming that Title to himself.

And thus having shewn by what degrees this See advanc'd it self in the Christian Church, till at length it gain'd Universal Supremacy over the *Catholick Church*; it is not at present material to shew how it used it, that is another dispute, my present business is to shew that there was no such thing from the beginning, either by Divine Right, or Apostolical Prescription; or so much as Ecclesiastical

astical Constitution in the following Ages in the Church ; that it was never pretended to, till the 5th. nor settled till the 6th. Century ; and lastly, that its settlement was made by a very Incompetent Authority ; and that so very late, that it was only born time enough to be Elder Brother to *Mahometanism*, that being brought forth under the Reign of *Phocas*, and this under his immediate Successour *Heraclius* : But here *Baronius* is very merry, and tells us, *That when we make such a noise about the Popes being first made head of the Church by Phocas, we are like a pack of Hounds hunting a painted Hare: or like Saul's Messengers that when they thought they had taken David, found they had only a Logg to their Prisoner: For ahlas what if Phocas did declare this Title, to be the Right of the Bishop of Rome; did he therefore first grant it? Is it not evident from all the Records of the Church, that the Bishop of Rome ever had it in all Ages? Is it not then ridiculous that when this Tyrant out of a Pique to Cyriacus happened to do it right, to infer that it had none before? For if we search the Annals of the Church from our Saviours coming, to Phocas his Reign (which is 600. years) we shall scarce find a year to have passed without a Precedent of the Popes Primacy; and this is so clear that it will be*

Anno Dom.
606.

easier to deny that the Sun shines, or the Fire burns, than to obscure the Glistering Evidence of this Truth. Boldly said Cardinal!

But your cause requires it, for it is nothing but Confidence that sets you up and bears the People down; for they cannot imagin that you should be so peremptory in your Opinion, without an Infallible assurance of your being in the Right. But when these general Challenges are reduc'd to particular Precedents, what work do you make with the Records of the Church? your whole business is to impose upon and pervert every thing that concerns your selves, so that I must crave leave to be as positive in the right as you are in the wrong, and tell you that there is not one Precedent in the ancient Church on your side, and that the whole Practice of the *Catholick Church* is a perpetual Precedent against you. And that I may not be confident as you are without just Reason; I will close with your Chalenge and appeal to the Monuments of the Church. I have already told mine own Story out of them honestly and Impartially, and if it be true, your Cause is overthrown, for then it is certain that the Power you pretend to by Divine Right is meer Usurpation, and for the truth of it, I must leave it to the judgment of the World; and though I doubt
not

not but that there may be divers less material slips and mistakes in it ; yet I am so assur'd of my own Integrity, that I know that as to the main Point I drive at, I have Irrefragable Truth on my side: And therefore having done mine own part of the work, you may demolish it if you can ; I will now return back with you to yours, and examine those Precedents and Records of the Church, that you alledge on your behalf, and then when we have compar'd yours and mine together, let him be laugh'd at *that Catches the Painted Hare*. But at present I am tyr'd with this tedious Chace of 600 years, and therefore shall adjourn the Match till the next Season. In the mean while I shall only desire the Reader to observe that I dispute not in a Destructive and Negative way, nor Interest my self in the Quarrel of this or that particular Party. My only Concernment is for real Truth, which I must and will assert against all sorts of Opposition. And therefore in every part of this Argument I shall begin with the Demonstration of that, and that being firmly laid, I shall from thence proceed to the Conviction of all kinds of Errour. For the Enormity of Errour lyes meerly in its distance from Truth, and if the Distance be the same, it is all one to me whether it lye *East* or *West*.

West. So that this will engage me in the Opposition of all Extreams, and I shall make no difference between Parties, how much soever they differ between themselves, that agree in departing from the true Constitution of the *Christian Church*. For the only rule and measure of our *Reformation* is the Original Practice of the *Primitive* and *Apostolick Church*, and the Corruption of the Church of *Rome* lyes in nothing else than its departure and separation from that, so that the only design of reforming the *Christian Church* is to return so far back to its first Constitution, as the Church of *Rome* hath departed from it. And if we do not limit it by those Bounds that are prescrib'd from the beginning; we may indeed make ten thousand alterations in the Church, but not one Reformation. And therefore if any other Churches that have cashier'd the Corruptions of the Church of *Rome*, instead of reforming themselves by the Primitive Rule, have erected any new *Fabrick* of their own devising, whatever Titles they may give themselves, they are in the same Case and Condemnation with the Church of *Rome*, and instead of amending its Errors, have only exchang'd the old *Apostacy* for a new one.

Seeing therefore the defence of Truth will engage me in a defiance to all sorts of Errour, I shall forbear particular Application to any Party of men, till I come to sum up the Evidence in the Conclusion of the whole, because till then the Charge will not come in its full force, but then it will fall with equal weight upon all. And I am afraid before I have done, I shall prove the Church of *Rome* to be much more *Catholick* than it thinks it self to be. And shake some of its most Zealous Friends and Fiercest Enemies into the same bagg of Communion.

F I N I S.